

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, and October (double number); the REVIEW in February, May, July, September, November, and December.

# The Classical Review

EDITORS { E. HARRISON, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.  
Prof. W. M. CALDER, LL.D., 58, St. Albans Road, Edinburgh.

All correspondence should be addressed to Prof. CALDER. Books for review should be sent to the Publisher.

## Board of Management:

Prof. J. F. DOBSON, M.A., Chairman.

Prof. R. S. CONWAY, Litt.D., F.B.A.  
Prof. A. C. CLARK, Litt.D., F.B.A.  
Prof. H. A. ORMEROD, M.A.  
Prof. H. WILLIAMSON, M.A.  
(Hon. Treasurer).

With the Chairman,  
representing the Council  
of the Classical  
Association.

E. A. BARBER, M.A. (Hon. Secretary), representing  
the Oxford Philological Society.

Prof. D. S. ROBERTSON, M.A., representing the  
Cambridge Philological Society.

With the co-operation of Prof. E. K. RAND, Harvard University.

Vol. XLVI

JULY, 1932

No. 3

## CONTENTS

	PAGE		PAGE
LATIN POETS IN THE BRITISH PARLIAMENT.		REVIEWS (continued):	
C. A. VINCE .. .. .	97	<i>Festschrift Richard Reitzenstein zum 2. April</i>	
THE EXPOSURE OF CHILDREN AND GREEK		1931 dargebracht. E. A. BARBER ..	126
ETHICS. A. CAMERON .. .. .	105	<i>Geschichte der Autobiographie, I (Misch).</i>	
THREE NEW LINES OF LUCAN. A. SOUTER	114	M. CARY .. .. .	127
REVIEWS:		<i>Sylla, ou la Monarchie manquée (Carcopino).</i>	
<i>The Early Age of Greece, II (Ridgeway):</i>		M. CARY .. .. .	128
<i>The Earlier Religion of Greece (Evans).</i>		<i>Cicero: Pro Milone, etc (Watts). G. B. A.</i>	
R. M. DAWKINS .. .. .	114	FLETCHER .. .. .	129
<i>Wanderings in Greece (Burnell). A. M.</i>		<i>Roman Literary Theory and Criticism</i>	
WOODWARD .. .. .	116	(D'Alton). J. WIGHT DUFF .. .. .	130
<i>Histoire Grecque, II (Glotz). W. R. HALLI-</i>		<i>Les Satires de Juvénal (de Labriolle). A. E.</i>	
DAY .. .. .	118	HOUSMAN .. .. .	131
<i>Greek Comedy (Norwood). A. W. PICKARD-</i>		<i>Roman Britain 1914-1928 (Macdonald). J.</i>	
CAMBRIDGE .. .. .	118	G. C. ANDERSON .. .. .	132
<i>Aristotle's Psychology of Conduct (Griffin).</i>		<i>Dictionnaire étymologique de la Langue latine</i>	
G. R. G. MURE .. .. .	121	(Ernout et Meillet); <i>A Concise Etymo-</i>	
<i>La Poetica di Aristotele (Bignami); Aristotle</i>		<i>logical Dictionary of Latin (Tucker). P.</i>	
<i>on the Art of Poetry (Owen). C. KEITH</i>		S. NOBLE .. .. .	133
<i>The Archons of Athens in the Hellenistic Age</i>		<i>Constantine the Great and the Christian</i>	
(Dinsmoor). W. W. TARN .. .. .	123	<i>Church (Baynes); Constantine the Great</i>	
<i>Musa Furiata (Pember). G. A. DAVIES</i>		<i>and the Christian Revolution (Baker). G.</i>	
<i>A Companion to Greek Studies (Whibley).</i>		W. RICHARDSON .. .. .	136
A. S. OWEN .. .. .	125	SHORT REVIEWS .. .. .	137
		BOOKS RECEIVED .. .. .	143

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

NEW YORK: G. E. STECHERT & CO., 31-33, EAST 10TH STREET.

Price of the present number, 1s. net. Yearly subscription, 12s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$3. Combined yearly subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 25s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$6.25.

## THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on a payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices, though the reduction cannot be guaranteed unless the subscription is paid before January 31st in each year. *Greece and Rome* may be obtained for an annual subscription of 7s. 6d.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. F. C. G. Langford, 35, Alleyn Park, Dulwich, S.E. 21. Inquiries should be sent to The Triangle Offices, 61, South Molton Street, W. 1, addressed either to the Hon. Secretaries of the Association (Miss E. C. Gedge and Mr. R. M. Rattenbury) or to the Hon. Secretary of any one of the District Branches—viz., Aberystwyth, Bedfordshire, Birmingham, Bristol, Cambridge, Cardiff, Hull, Kent, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Northumberland and Durham, North Wales, Nottingham, Oxford, Reading, Sheffield, Southampton, South-Western, Sussex, Swansea, Taunton and West Somerset.

## The Loeb Classical Library

EDITED BY

T. E. PAGE, LITT.D.

E. CAPPS, PH.D., LL.D.      W. H. D. ROUSE, LITT.D.

*Each volume, Foolscap 8vo, 400-600 pages. Clear type. Cloth, 10s. net.  
Leather, 12s. 6d. net.*

A series of Greek and Latin Texts, with English Translations on the opposite page. The Series is to contain all that is best in Greek and Latin Literature, from the time of Homer to the end of the Western Empire.

'We shall never be independent of our Loeb.'—TIMES LIT. SUPP.

**NEW BOOKS READY, Autumn, 1932**

### Greek

- 264. *Aristotle. POLITICS.* Translated by H. RACKHAM.
- 265. *Eusebius. THE ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.* In two vols. Vol. II. Translated by E. L. OULTON.
- 266. *Select Papyri.* In two vols. Vol. I. Translated by A. S. HUNT and C. C. EDGAR.

### Latin

- 263. *Scriptores Historiae Augustae.* In three vols. Vol. III. Translated by D. MAGIE.

**Ready Shortly.**

- 63 & 64. *Virgil.* Translated by H. R. FAIRCLOUGH. New and revised edition.

Descriptive Prospectus giving particulars of the volumes already published and those in preparation will be sent free on application to the publishers.

WILLIAM HEINEMANN, Windmill Press, Kingswood, Tadworth, Surrey

t and  
upon  
tional  
(c) to  
create

annual  
of 5s.  
dings  
ssical  
ssical  
ss the  
ay be

, Mr.  
ent to  
Hon.  
or to  
wyth,  
eeds,  
North  
stern,

y

site  
are,

ted  
nd

by

on.  
in





# The Classical Review

JULY, 1932

## LATIN POETS IN THE BRITISH PARLIAMENT.

NEARLY a quarter of a century ago a Latinist of high distinction, Professor Tyrrell of Dublin, having cited in his lectures a famous example of the grand style of Lucretius, took occasion to observe:

'This grand passage was quoted some few years ago with great effect by Mr. Gladstone in the House of Commons. It will probably stand as the last specimen of that faculty for happy quotation from Latin poetry which once adorned the debates of that assembly, but which now seems to have completely disappeared.'

It is highly improbable that an extinct art, of which Mr. Gladstone was the last surviving practitioner, will ever be revived; and there are not many who will regret its disuse. It might plausibly be represented, not as an art, but as a boyish habit, unsuited for that maturity of wisdom which Parliament has now attained. Like all other rhetorical devices, it became tedious and offensive when unskillfully used. It was an easy trick, enabling orators, who had nothing of value to say, to commend their worthless contributions by a cheap and tawdry decoration. Today the value of all rhetorical ornament has depreciated, and one language will easily supply as much decoration as any audience is willing to tolerate. Nevertheless, the history of a practice that was diligently pursued by such men as Chatham, Burke, Fox, Pitt, Canning, Peel, Palmerston, and Gladstone would not be without interest if written by a competent hand. The eloquence of these men is still admired, if no longer imitated. At the least, we may insist that classical quotation, as practised by them, was a genuine art; that it is still capable of affording pleasure to readers of a literary turn; and that, being dead, it is entitled to an obituary notice.

The contribution here offered to such a history is based upon a collection, incomplete, but perhaps sufficient for our purpose, of about five hundred

passages from the Latin poets which have been used in reported speeches. The count of the speeches from which they are taken is considerably larger, as many of the quotations have made frequent reappearances. The number of the Latin poets who have in this way been made to contribute to the enlightenment of a distant age is sixteen, the largest contributors being Virgil, Horace, Juvenal, and Ovid.

The conditions under which the practice of Latin quotation flourished, and with the disappearance of which it decayed, are easily discerned. For a century after the first introduction of reporters the members of both Houses were, with few exceptions, public-school men educated on a system based on Latin studies. Orators were therefore able to draw their maxims and illustrations from Latin poetry without exceeding the limits of the knowledge with which their audience might be fairly credited. It is significant that such quotation became infrequent for a few years after 1832, as though speakers were afraid that it might be unwelcome to members of a new type, sent to Parliament by the newly enfranchised large towns. It was, however, soon revived, presumably because the fear of illiteracy, of which so much had been made by opponents of Reform, was found to be baseless. The gradual decay of the practice is to be dated rather from the second Reform Act.

If there is any value in literary allusion, or any advantage in associating the argument of the passing day with the wisdom of the ages and with perennial issues, we need not hesitate to admit that parliamentarians of the old school were fortunate in having recourse to a literature distinguished among all the literatures of the world for a certain terseness and pregnancy of phrasing. The lover of poetry will make many exceptions in his praise of the Latin poets; he may even frame definitions

of poetry that will exclude both them and their English imitators from Parnassus. But they were all good rhetoricians, or, let us rather say, they were incomparable in those elements of expression which are common to good rhetoric and to good verse. And if anyone should suggest that to hunt an ancient literature for aphorisms and ornaments is to do dishonour to the greater literature which Englishmen inherit, the answer is that no such dishonour was done by any of the orators with whom we are here concerned. The reader of *Hansard* can easily satisfy himself that the parliamentary use of quotations from the English poets—and especially from Shakespeare, Milton, and Pope—both flourished and decayed simultaneously with the practice of appealing to Horace and Virgil. Whatever may be the demerits of classical education, it cannot honestly be accused as unfavourable to the study and appreciation of our own literature. Indeed, the friends of the old system may justly claim that it helped to give breadth of outlook and elevation of mind to nearly all the most renowned statesmen of past generations, and to deliver such men as Burke and Pitt, Peel and Gladstone, Canning and Macaulay, from some of the deteriorating influences of partisan strife.

We begin with two quotations, classical in a double sense, which made a deep and lasting impression on the mind of the House of Commons, and were frequently recalled to memory. The first place is due to the exquisite lines in which Horace describes the pacification of a stormy sea by Castor and Pollux:

Simul alba nautis  
stella refulsit,  
defluit saxi agitatus umor,  
concidunt venti fugiuntque nubes,  
et minax, quod sic volvere, ponto  
unda recumbit.

Burke first used these lines in 1775 in his passionate plea for a conciliatory policy towards the American Colonies, reminding the House of the fortunate and lasting results of conciliation in Wales, and especially of the grant of parliamentary representation in 35

Henry VIII.: 'When the day-star of the English constitution had arisen in their hearts, all was harmony within and without.' The fine imagery and the illuminating verses were long remembered. The whole passage was repeated with emotion by Fox, twenty-three years later, after Burke's death; and the Horatian verses were requoted, after Burke and Fox, in 1822 by Marryat, with a new reference to the history of Jamaica and Trinidad; and in 1829 by Grey; and again by Lyndhurst, promising a restoration of the tranquillity of the Empire if the Catholic Claims were granted. In the same year Huskisson turned the quotation to new account in his advocacy of Parliamentary Reform. Finally, Lyndhurst again used it in 1851 exactly in the spirit of Burke and on a similar occasion, supporting the grant of representative institutions to Cape Colony. It had also been used, less fortunately and without reference to Burke, by Gladstone in 1838, when he declared that Canada had been tranquillised by the mere announcement of the appointment of Lord Durham as Governor. With Burke's quotation may be associated a similar Horatian passage, happily used by Lord Portman in 1837 to express the hopes with which the people were greeting the accession of the young Queen:

Instar veris enim voltus ubi tuus  
affulsit populo, gratior it dies  
et soles melius nitent.

The second of the two most memorable citations was taken from the prayer of Aeneas before battle in the last book of the *Aeneid*,

Non ego nec Teucris Italos parere iubebo,  
nec mihi regna peto; paribus se legibus ambae  
invictae gentes aeterna in foedera mittant.

It was employed by Pitt in 1800 to illustrate the spirit and purpose with which he proposed the Union of Great Britain and Ireland. The Whigs, though they did not love Pitt, and even suspected his sincerity, never forgot his verses, but adopted them as a declaration of their own faith in regard to Ireland. Charles Grant repeated them in 1828 in a speech in support of the Catholic Claims; Macaulay in 1840 in opposition to Peel's Irish Registration

Bill; and Russell in 1844 in one of the frequently recurring debates on the state of Ireland. John O'Connell, demanding the repeal of the Union in 1848, spoke of 'the quotation with which our degradation was mocked.' Brougham in 1845, and Palmerston in 1862, transferred the application to the relations between England and France. Palmerston was proposing a new system of fortification at a time when he was also promoting a short-lived *entente cordiale*; and declared that 'a footing of equality with respect to self-defence was the only possible foundation for a strong friendship and alliance,' a doctrine unwelcome to Liberals of the school of Bright.

Before parting with Pitt's famous quotation let us set beside it another sentence, equal in beauty and even more appropriate. It was taken from the *Adelphi* of Terence:

Ego vero hoc iubeo, et hac re et aliis omnibus,  
quam maxime unam facere nos hanc familiam,  
colere, adiuvere, adiungere.

The speaker to whom we owe the application of these lines to the Irish question is Spencer Walpole, supporting the Irish Education Bill of 1850.

When Macaulay repeated a passage of Pitt containing these words of Virgil, he was using Latin in the House of Commons for the first and last time. He never quoted on his own account. This reticence is remarkable, for it was unexampled among the great debaters of his own and of the preceding generation; his memory was prodigious, and his study of the Latin classics incessant; and in his writings he practised the art of quotation with a success to which it would be difficult to find a parallel. All the quotations, Latin, Greek, Italian, and English, in the *Essays from the Edinburgh Review* are singularly felicitous and helpful, and every scholar is grateful for the unexpected appearance of a passage from Aristophanes in a note on the twenty-first chapter of the *History*. Why did he leave unused the verses from the poets he loved which must have suggested themselves to his mind whenever he took part in debate? The abstinence, being total, must have been based on some principle analogous to that which forbade him to use foreign words in an English sentence. We

know that he submitted himself to restrictions which, as a critic, he did not seek to impose on others. He was refusing to follow the example of his own masters; for he had accepted his place in the succession of Fox, and no man cherished a deeper veneration for Burke.

Any collection of the verses quoted by Burke might well serve to illustrate those qualities of his mental habit which are universally recognised: his faculty for lofty conceptions and comprehensive views; the extent and profundity of his knowledge; his skill in choosing from an ample storehouse the best word, the aptest metaphor, the most illuminating illustration. Set side by side any twelve of Burke's quotations with an equal number of those used, let us say, by Sir Francis Burdett, and you have at once a measure of the difference between a very great mind and a comparatively small one, between classical oratory and good speaking. But it is not necessary to make such a collection, for Burke's skill in the art under review is exhibited to most advantage in those written compositions which have an assured place in English literature. The parliamentary quotations illustrate also Burke's greatest fault, the coarseness and violence of his humour, as when in 1785 he compared Dundas and his 'six chopping bastards'—the six reports of the Committee of Secrecy—to 'the sow of imperial augury lying in the mud with all the prodigies of her fertility about her':

Triginta caput fetus enixa iacebat  
alba solo recubans, albi circum ubera nati.

It is between Burke and Canning that the final choice would lie if a critic were to award an imaginary prize for proficiency in our art. To claim for Canning the highest place among the masters of parliamentary oratory would be provocative; but it may at least be said that in wit, dexterity, and resource, perhaps also in grace, his eloquence was incomparable. If a personal opinion may be hazarded, the parliamentary speeches which can always be read without weariness for the sake of their literary charm are those of Canning, Burke, and John Bright. Bright, however, was no quoter; his attention was too fully concentrated on the argument

to admit literary reminiscence. If he did not quote Virgil because he had not been taught to like Virgil, neither did he quote Milton, whom he knew by heart.

Of many specimens of a skill which Canning used always with discretion, never for mere ostentation, we may choose first his fine application of the last sentence of Juvenal's tenth satire. In the year 1809 the prospects of the Peninsular War were discouraging. We had fought Napoleon for many years, and by sea successfully; but our army had not yet achieved anything effective against him. We must bear in mind Napoleon's singular faith in his own fortune: 'Fortune is a woman,' he had said, 'and the more she does for me, the more I will require of her.' Nor should we forget that Fox's reiterated belief in Napoleon's invincibility had become an article of faith with the Opposition. Pitt was dead, and the duty of upholding the resolution of the nation had fallen upon Canning. 'Napoleon's fortune,' he said, 'has been augmented; but it is fortune, not fate, and is not to be considered immutable and fixed. We must not defer to this fortune as to the dispensations of Providence.'

Nos te,  
nos facimus, Fortuna, deam, caeloque locamus.

Without the aid of Juvenal the necessary lesson could not have been so effectively taught: the words penetrated a dangerous and, as the event proved, a baseless superstition.

Early in the year 1812, in which this superstition was at last to be shattered by a great military disaster, Canning had occasion to use another verse of Juvenal:

Quicquid habent telorum armamentaria caeli.

Napoleon was about to lead against Russia an army of Frenchmen, Italians, Germans, Austrians, Poles, Switzers, and Dutchmen; but Canning had to treat with ridicule the fears of those who thought that the most formidable part of the new coalition was the power of the Pope, and that Napoleon was going to 'substitute the thunders of the Vatican for mere mortal artillery.' Again, in 1823, it became his duty to

take exception to hard names applied by the Opposition to the conduct of friendly Powers. We might find, he said, that these potentates 'had not become insusceptible to feelings of irritation and resentment.'

Medio de fonte leporum  
surgit amari aliquid, quod in ipsis floribus angat.

The quotation from Lucretius was already commonplace; but the reader will observe its ironical intention: in British censures of foreign behaviour the *amari aliquid* is generally more conspicuous than the *lepores* or the *flores*. The dexterity of Canning also illustrates the value of the method of literary allusion as enabling a speaker to convey a more pungent meaning than he would care to put into plain English. In 1813 he had to rebuke, as inconsistent with Christian charity, the violence of clerical petitions against Catholic Claims; but discretion was imposed upon him, not only by customary respect for the Church, but also by his disagreement with his own party. He had recourse to the verse by which the violence of Caesar is rebuked in the prophecy of Anchises:

Tuque prior, tu parce, genus qui ducis Olympo!

The verse was remembered, and was cited on a similar occasion, when the question was the admission of Jews to Parliament, by Lord Carlisle in 1849. It had already been used, with the addition of the following words *proice tela manu*, by Chatham, calling, in 1775, for the withdrawal of the troops sent to intimidate Boston. Ostensibly the advice was offered to Ministers, but really to the King; and the true direction of the remonstrance is indicated in the terms of the Latin, for no one would suppose that Chatham attributed an Olympian descent to Lord North.

In his youth Canning had brought off a sort of hoax in the House of Commons by declaiming a pseudo-Horatian stanza—written by Jortin, a versifier of the eighteenth century—in an ornamental speech celebrating Nelson's recent victory in the Battle of the Nile. Nelson showed his gratification by adopting Jortin's words, *palnam qui meruit ferat*, as his motto. Many people



have since searched Horace in vain for this verse. Other modern writers of Latin verse who have been similarly honoured in Parliament are Gray, Johnson, and Bishop Lowth. The only Latin hexameter ever quoted by Bright is also of modern composition; it may be found, where Bright doubtless found it, on the title-page of Bagster's Bibles.

Canning's wit and audacity were unmatched in Parliament until the advent of Disraeli. This great debater never made a habit of quoting Latin; but his scanty quotations have two merits: they were always unfamiliar and always relevant to his purpose. He made his way from contempt to leadership by the use of many weapons of offence, and not least by his mastery of ironical invective; and he used the Latin poets to give point or venom to his sarcasm. Two examples of his skill may suffice. The *Odes* of Horace supply many familiar quotations—all worn to tatters in parliamentary service. Everybody, for example, to whom popular opinion was *civium ardor prava iubentium* could, and nearly everybody did, apply the words *iustum et tenacem propositi* to his party, or to his country, or to himself. The *Epodes*, on the other hand, being less used by schoolmasters, have made very few appearances in debate. In the course of his fierce duel with Peel, in the great year 1846, Disraeli put into the mouth of his antagonist the words: 'I, a Protectionist Minister, mean to govern England by the aid of the Anti-Corn-Law League.' With the fairness of the stroke we are not here concerned; but what could be more telling than the couplet—with a sting in its tail—by which Disraeli drove it home?

Vectabor umeris tunc ego inimicis eques,  
meaqueque terra cedet insolentiae.

Two years later the triumphant leaders of the League, having achieved their Repeal of the Corn Laws, had become Financial Reformers, and were calling for a reduction of £5,000,000—the more sanguine put it at £10,000,000—in the national taxation and expenditure. Again, it may, or may not, have been fair to reproach men who had discovered, and persuaded Parliament to adopt, a measure by which the national

wealth was to be vastly increased, with their present zeal for a comparatively small economy; but Disraeli, ironically enquiring why they were not satisfied to deduct their five or ten millions from the increment of a hundred millions which they had promised as the result of Repeal, again had his couplet ready:

Quibus divitias pollicentur, ab iis drachmam  
ipsi petunt;  
de his divitiis sibi deducant drachmam, red-  
dant cetera.

The verses come from a short fragment of Ennius, preserved by Cicero in his treatise *On Divination*. The old poet was directing his wit upon fortune-tellers who expected a shilling in return for the promise of great wealth; and, if Cobden and Bright ever cared to verify the quotation, they found that they had been compared to *superstitiosi vates impudentesque harioli*, and to ignorant guides *qui sibi semitam non sapiunt, alteri monstrant viam*. One of the uses of literary allusion is to convey an unparliamentary insult. Disraeli's personalities naturally provoked retort, as when he was told by Graham in 1859 that he was a living contradiction of the Horatian maxim

Lenit albescent animos capillus,

a verse that had been used by Fox in 1804 by way of apology for his own meekness.

The orators whose speeches supply the largest number of quotations from the Latin poets are Brougham, Burdett, and Graham. Burdett and Graham had sufficient force and originality to hold the attention of their contemporaries; yet, from lack of consistency of purpose, neither of them makes a great figure in the history of their time. The fame of Brougham, though it has waned, is still enduring. His speeches in both Houses occupy an enormous number of the columns of *Hansard*; and we must presume that they commanded attention, for no man could have spoken so often and so copiously to a scanty or a listless audience. That his speaking was effective in a very high degree we know from the testimony, both friendly and jealous, of the times; and he was encouraged by many flattering compliments. In 1825, for



example, Canning politely acknowledged his power in debate in the words used by Diomedes of Aeneas :

Stetimus tela aspera contra  
contulimusque manus ; experto credite quantus  
in clipeum adsurgat, quo turbine torqueat  
hastam ;

a passage that was also happily adduced by Peel in 1843, when two great warriors, Wellington and Soult, were exerting their influence for pacific purposes in England and in France. To the reader Brougham's oratory appears extraordinarily energetic and spontaneous, but wasteful of words and poor in literary quality. The specimen selected for exhibition in Sir Henry Craik's *English Prose Writers* is forensically effective ; but it is not English prose. The impression that is left is that the mind of the speaker was more active than penetrating ; that his knowledge was rather extensive than profound ; and that his fluency enabled him to make a speech on any subject before he had taken pains to understand it. His quotations illustrate these defects. They are uneconomical, wasting more words than they save. They testify to wide reading and a good memory ; but they are commonly mere ornaments lending no support to the argument ; and not infrequently they are ludicrously irrelevant or unnecessary. He could not warn a person of noble lineage that his birth would tell against him, if he did not conduct himself properly, without citing Horace's *silvae filia nobilis* ; nor adduce from the history of an old lawsuit a prediction that did not come true without exclaiming with Virgil :

Nescia mens hominum fati sortisque futurae !

Occasionally, however, these random arrows hit the mark, as when, in a speech on the Treaty of Washington in 1848, Brougham introduced words taken from the *Eunuchus* of Terence which exactly described the unhappy relations that had subsisted between Great Britain and the United States since the Declaration of Independence :

Iniuriae,  
suspiciones, inimicitiae, indutiae,  
bellum, pax rursum.

Brougham is also to be credited with the first introduction of words, drawn from Virgil's description of Rumour, that were destined to become very familiar to the House :

Parva metu primo mox sese attollit in auras  
ingrediturque solo et caput inter nubila condit.

Here he was a true prophet ; for he was speaking of the Income Tax. The couplet was afterwards well worked : it was used in 1828 of the Catholic Claims, in 1867 of the Cattle Plague, and in 1866, in Gladstone's Budget speech, of the expedient of borrowing.

Sir Francis Burdett also, though in general content with commonplace, used his Latin on occasion with good effect, as in 1822, when he addressed to Londonderry—the statesman more generally remembered as the Castle-reagh of the House of Commons—the Horatian advice :

Lusisti satis, edisti satis atque bibisti ;  
tempus abire tibi est ;

the implication being that, since the Peace, Londonderry's attendances at international conferences and foreign courts had been rather convivial than useful ; or when he turned the same satirist to account in his description of the two voices of O'Connell, the good set Saxon in which he addressed the House of Commons and his more Milesian utterances at Dublin :

Patriis intermiscere petita  
verba foris malis, Canusini more bilinguis.

From Brougham and Burdett we turn backwards to a greater man and a greater age of parliamentary eloquence. In Pitt's choice of passages for quotation may be discerned the same qualities of mind that informed the well-remembered traits of his oratory, his taste for resounding phrases, and for lofty and indistinct conceptions.

Opposite him sat Fox, whose duty, as he conceived it, was to cool the ardours that Pitt had generated. Fox's method of dealing with the verses of high Roman temper which Pitt chose for his declamations was to save them in his memory until some turn of events should bring an opportunity of holding them up to ridicule. The most famous of all parliamentary examples of our

art is Pitt's proud and characteristic use of the Horatian stanza *laudo manentem*, after his resignation of office. It is known to all readers, yet it must not be omitted here. We add the preceding stanza, which Pitt could trust his hearers to supply from their own memory, as also the words *et mea virtute me involvo*, which he emphasised by omission:

Fortuna saevo laeta negotio et  
ludum insolentem ludere pertinax  
transmutat incertos honores,  
nunc mihi nunc alii benigna.

laudo manentem; si celeres quatit  
pennas, resigno quae dedit et mea  
virtute me involvo, probamque  
pauperiem sine dote quaero.

The following passage may be described as Miltonic, though it was written by so tame a poet as Ovid:

Me credite Lesbon,  
me Tenedon Chrysenque et Cillan, Apollinis  
urbes,  
et Scyrum cepisse; mea concussa putate  
procubuisse solo Lyrnesia moenia dextra.

Pitt quoted these lines in December, 1796, on an occasion that hardly justified the grand manner. Napoleon's first campaign was still incomplete; and some successes against the French Republic had been gained by the allies of Great Britain. Pitt's point was that, although the British army had not helped in the fighting, the subsidies voted by Parliament entitled Great Britain to a share in the credit of victory. Thirteen months later Fox requoted the passage in a spirit of exultant irony; for in the meantime Bonaparte had won the victory of Rivoli, and invaded Austria, and had compelled the Austrians to admit defeat in the armistice of Leoben and the treaty of Campo Formio. Earlier in the struggle Pitt had found a Virgilian sentence which exactly suited his purpose: he would never yield, he declared, until he could exclaim with Latinus:

Potuit quae plurima virtus  
esse, fuit; toto certatum est corpore regni.

This was said at the end of 1794, before Napoleon had made his first appearance as a commander. It was, as Fox was quick to notice, a dangerous quotation, for it was taken from the speech of a

king doomed to defeat. Fox retorted it upon Pitt a year later, after Vendémiaire and the whiff of grapeshot, when the political changes at Paris seemed to him to afford an opportunity for negotiations; and again in 1800, the year of Marengo: when Napoleon—then recently created First Consul—had finally beaten Pitt, he 'would have to repeat his words with a different application.'

The topic that elicited the largest expenditure of this sort of erudition was the long-vexed question of the Catholic Claims. For many years it furnished an annual debate in each House. Annual motions have disappeared since Ministries took control of legislation and required all the time for their own business. When they were part of the established practice, the debates tended to become occasions for epideictic oratory, and the customary decorations were in request. Not many of these flowers appear to deserve any sort of resurrection. Nonconformists, however, may be glad to be reminded that, as early as 1812, their recognised spokesman in the House of Commons, William Smith, associated the Nonconformist with the Catholic cause by citing from Horace:

Nam tua res agitur paries cum proximus ardet.

We may also recall the rather impudent macaronic which Canning made out of two Horatian verses:

Modo reges atque tetrarchas,  
omnia magna, loquens, modo vestries atque  
churchwardens;

in ridicule of the trifling objections of business which opponents of the Claims had substituted, in 1821, for their earlier apprehensions of 'a tottering throne, a trembling crown, a shaking sceptre.' There was some humour also in the picture which Plunket, with the help of Virgil, drew of the probable behaviour of English gentlemen if anyone should try to deprive them of the rights denied to Irish Catholics:

Hinc exaudiri gemitus iraeque leonum  
vincla recusantum et sera sub nocte gementum.

In 1829, the year of concession, the Bishop of Oxford advised the House of Lords that objections founded on falsity

of doctrine, imputations of idolatry, and the like came too late; the opportunity of declaring Roman views detrimental to the State had been missed when Parliament had framed an oath dealing only with civil allegiance:

*Tum decuit metuuisse tuis; nunc sera querelis  
haud iustis adsurgis et irrita iurgia iactas.*

It is strange to think of Virgil and Horace being ransacked year after year for weapons to use in a conflict to which the problems of the Augustan Empire, tolerant of all religions, offered no parallel. The cynically disposed may also find amusement in the reflection that in the end the great torrent of eloquence and reasoning went to waste, for the issue was finally settled, not by any triumph of principle, but by way of a prudent evasion of the peril of civil war. Peel at least, whose defection from the Protestant side turned the scale—though no one seems to have thought of quoting *momentumque fuit mutatus Curio rerum*—made no pretence of yielding to reason: his Virgilian quotation in 1829 was:

*Coeant in foedera dextrae,  
si datur, ast armis concurrant arma cavete.*

The concession was, he said, 'an alternative by which civil war may be honourably averted.' Palmerston, a consistent supporter of the Claims, came to his aid with a verse from Lucan:

*Omnibus hostes  
reddite nos populis, civile avertite bellum.*

It was then sixteen years since Canning, with an earlier recognition of the same danger, had cited the famous *aposiopesis*:

*Quos ego*—sed motos praestat componere fluctus;

'Our first duty is to tranquillise the storm.' The verse had been used by Wilkes in 1778, when Lord North, after waiting too long, had vainly accepted the principle of conciliation with the American Colonies: 'the minister of wrath no longer alarms the Colonists with his *Quos ego*'; and it was repeated by Canning in 1824 with

a finer and more truly Virgilian application: Jamaica, he admitted, had given just cause of offence to Parliament, but 'the consciousness of superior strength disarms the spirit of resentment.'

The later and less well-known Latin poets have been used but little by our Parliamentary speakers. Disraeli derived from Claudian the verse which he applied, after the death of Wellington, to the veneration with which the great Duke had been regarded in his old age:

*Emicuit Stilichonis apex, et cognita fulsit  
canities;*

but he was accused of the sin of borrowing it at second hand. The same poet supplied the early Free-traders with a couplet admirably adapted to their argument; it was first used by Poulett Thompson in 1829:

*Ingeniis patuit campus, certusque merenti  
stat favor: ornatur propriis industria donis.*

Burke drew from lines written by Silius Italicus in honour of Cicero a majestic compliment to his friend Fox on the occasion of the introduction of the East India Bill, which brought the Coalition to grief:

*Indole, pro, quanta iuvenis, quantumque daturus  
Ausoniae populis ventura in saecula civem.  
ille super Gangem super exauditus et Indos  
implebit terras voce, et furialia bella  
fulmine compescet linguae.*

Finally, we may revive the memory of a useful couplet from Ausonius's poor attempt to versify the wisdom of the Seven Wise Men of Greece:

*Quod prudentis opus? cui possit, nolle nocere.  
quid stulti proprium? non posse et velle nocere*

It was employed by Lord Holland in 1830 when he was condemning the conduct of Ministers in regard to the troubles of Greece; but it might appear applicable to other and later blunders of a fidgety and ineffective foreign policy.

C. A. VINCE.

[This article was found among the papers of Charles Anthony Vince, sometime Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge, and Headmaster of Mill Hill School, who died in 1929.]

THE EXPOSURE OF CHILDREN AND GREEK ETHICS.<sup>1</sup>

THE exposure of children is a subject of considerable interest for literature as well as for sociology, since the founding theme can be traced through myth, legend, tragedy, comedy, rhetoric, and lives of the saints down to modern times, and the practice itself has a history equally long. On the social and ethical side, which is our concern here, the subject has attracted attention from the rise of classical studies till to-day, but unfortunately judgment has often been clouded by prejudice. Historians, in pious horror at the barbarity of infanticide, have tended either to exalt the humanity of the early Christians at the expense of the wicked pagan or, in later days, to save the reputation of the Greeks by proving that in the fifth century at least the practice was really almost unknown. It is essential for an unbiassed treatment of the topic to recognise at the outset, firstly, that exposure is a method of limiting the family, and that family limitation springs from causes which have proved irresistible; secondly, that the cruelty involved in infanticide even by exposure is very slight, a fact which is well recognised in modern legal practice.

It would be impossible in the short space available for this paper to deal adequately with all the available material, and nothing more will be attempted here than a brief indication of the main sources of evidence and a somewhat fuller treatment of the history of public opinion on this subject so far as it can be traced. That the practice was common in Roman times is universally admitted.<sup>2</sup> It is proved for Bithynia by Pliny's letter to Trajan (X. 65, 66) and for Egypt by three passages in the *Gnomon* of the *Idiologus* (§§ 41, 107 and 92), and it is implied in a long series of legal documents before and after A.D. 374 (*Cod. Just.* VIII. 51, 2), by which date it had

become a crime. If confirmatory evidence were needed, it might be found with Carcopino<sup>3</sup> in the Table of Veleia, where we find in receipt of *alimenta* 34 girls and 145 boys, making 179 legitimate children as opposed to only 2 illegitimate. These figures may very well point to exposure of girls and illegitimate children.

In the Hellenistic period we have strong evidence of a general decline in the population of Greece to which reluctance to marry and to rear children seems to have contributed, but there is little direct proof of exposure as a cause, and opinion has differed as to the weight to be attached to the literary references which have been adduced in large numbers. These are drawn either from philosophers or from comic poets, and both are suspect, the former because they were often eccentric and paradoxical, the latter because they were handling a conventional literary theme which enabled them to introduce an element of romance without violating social usage. It must, however, be admitted that even the plot of a comedy is likely to have some relation to real life, and that the theme of exposure would never have held its ground on the stage if the practice had not been well known. The artificiality of these plots was felt even in ancient times, but it consisted not so much in the exposure as in the subsequent recognition, which, though not unknown, must have been extremely rare. Fortunately, we can illustrate by a concrete example the way in which what might appear at first glance to be a mere literary commonplace is rooted in the customs of real life. In the *Heauton Timorumenos* of Terence (translated from Menander) we find the theme of the unnatural husband who commands his wife to

<sup>1</sup> This paper is based on an inaugural address delivered in Aberdeen University. No attempt is made to give a complete apparatus of references to ancient or modern writers.

<sup>2</sup> I have not been able to consult Bennett, "The Exposure of Infants in Ancient Rome," in *Classical Journal* XVIII. (1923), p. 341.

<sup>3</sup> "Le droit romain d'exposition des enfants et le *Gnomon* de l'*Idiologue*" in *Mémoires de la Société nationale des Antiquaires de France*, Paris, 1928. The article does not deal with the Roman law regarding exposure apart from the imposition of the death duty of 25 per cent. on persons adopting a foundling in Egypt, which, it is suggested, was due to a wish to preserve the purity of Roman blood.



expose her baby if it should be a girl (626):

So. meministin me esse grauidam et mihi te  
maxumo opere edicere  
si puellam parerem, nolle tolli?

The same command recurs in Ovid (*Met.* IX. 678):

edita forte tuo fuerit si femina partu,  
(inuitus mando, pietas ignosce!) necetur.

Lastly, in Apuleius (*Met.* X. 23) we have the story again: *Maritum habuit cuius pater peregre proficiscens mandauit uxori suae . . . ut, si sexus sequioris edidisset fetum, prolinus quod esset editum necaretur.* It would be foolish to maintain that these writers were independently drawing on experience; they are obviously repeating a current theme; but that the theme itself is not out of relation to experience is proved by the famous letter of Hilarion (*P. Oxy.* 744) in which the cruel husband appears in flesh and blood: *ἐὰν πολλαπολλῶν τέκης ἐὰν ἦν ἄρσενον ἄφες, ἐὰν ἦν θήλεα ἐκβαλε.*

When the inquiry is carried back to classical Greece, the evidence direct and indirect becomes increasingly scant, and it has recently been maintained<sup>1</sup> that for Athens at least we are not justified in assuming that exposure was prevalent. The evidence for Athens is found in certain passages of Plato and Aristophanes. It is a cardinal point of Plato's political theory that the size of the state and therefore of the family must be limited, and he has in view artificial means to this end. The most important passages are *Laws* V. 740 (*ἐπισχέσεις γενέσεως*) and the often quoted *Republic* V. 460c: *τὰ δὲ τῶν χειρόνων, καὶ ἐὰν τι τῶν ἐτέρων ἀνάπηρον γίγνηται, ἐν ἀπορρήτῳ τε καὶ ἀδήλῳ κατακρύψουσιν ὡς πρέπει.* It has been objected to the citation of these passages, and the objection has a certain force, in the first place that Plato's state is a criticism rather than a reflection of contemporary Athenian practice, and in the second place that in this matter as in others we have to reckon with the influence of the customs of Sparta, where exposure of the deformed is not denied. There is, however, another passage in Plato which is not open to

these objections and which is convincing because it implies exposure in ordinary practice and does not introduce it as part of a theory. In *Theaetetus* (160e) the maieutic metaphor is developed as follows: *τοῦτο μὲν δὴ, ὡς ἔοικεν, μόλις ποτὲ ἐγεννήσαμεν, ὅτι δὴ ποτε τυγχάνει ὄν. μετὰ δὲ τὸν τόκον τὰ ἀμφιδρόμια αὐτοῦ ὡς ἀληθῶς ἐν κύκλῳ περιθρεκτέον τῷ λόγῳ, σκοπουμένους μὴ λάθῃ ἡμᾶς οὐκ ἄξιον ἐν τροφῇ τὸ γινόμενον, ἀλλὰ ἀνεμαϊόν τε καὶ ψεῦδος. ἡ σὺ οἶσι πάντως δεῖν τό γε σὸν τρέφειν καὶ μὴ ἀποτιθέναι, ἡ καὶ ἀνέξῃ ἐλεγχόμενον ὄρῳ, καὶ οὐ σφόδρα χαλεπανεῖς ἐὰν τις σοῦ ὡς πρωτοτόκου αὐτὸ ὑφαίρῃ;* This passage is interesting in several ways. It seems to prove that exposure was a possible fate for any child, with the customary exception of the first, but also perhaps that there was a certain public opinion against it. There is no reason to suppose that the passage refers to anything but Athenian practice. The evidence of Aristophanes has also been attacked with partial success. In *Thesmophoriazousae* (502 ff.) we have an amusing description of the introduction of a supposititious child while a distracted husband runs for the doctor. The child is brought in *ἐν χύτρᾳ*, a phrase which gives the scholiast occasion to explain *ὅτι ἐν χύτρᾳ τὰ παιδία ἐξετίθεσαν*, though of course the passage proves nothing with regard to exposure. A second reference (*Clouds* 528 ff.) concerns an illegitimate child and hence is not evidence for the custom in general. There remains, however, an important passage (*Frogs* 1190):

*ὅτε δὴ πρῶτον μὲν αὐτὸν γενόμενον  
χειμῶνος ὄντος ἐξέθεσαν ἐν ὀστράκῳ  
ἵνα μὴ ἔκτραφῃς γέναιτο τοῦ πατρὸς φονεῦς.*

Here van Hook argues that 'we have merely a reference to the well-known tale of the fate of Oedipus of Thebes': but the whole point lies in the words *ἐν ὀστράκῳ*. The reference to Oedipus is in the comic style, and *ἐν ὀστράκῳ* is obviously the vulgar detail from everyday life which makes the heroic ridiculous. Here again the scholiast explains that children were exposed *ἐν χύτραις*, and there is no reason to doubt his word, since he is merely repeating what we have in Aristophanes himself, and

<sup>1</sup> La Rue van Hook, *Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.*, 1920; Bolkestein, *Class. Phil.* XVII. (1922).



there is archaeological evidence that the *χύτρα* was in fact simply the ordinary coffin for infants. It seems likely that the exposed child was really prepared for death and that the *crepundia* which accompanied it were the little trinkets or amulets ordinarily worn by living children. These were placed with it *ὡς θανουμένῳ*<sup>1</sup> just as other objects were placed in the tombs of adults; their function as *γνωρίσματα* was probably secondary.<sup>2</sup>

It seems legitimate to conclude from this evidence, though it is admittedly slight, that exposure was familiar even in Athens of the classical period, though the prosperity of Attica in the fifth century may have made it less common then than it became later. That it should be familiar is only what we should expect from general considerations. It is clear from mythology and legend that the practice was known in the Mediterranean area<sup>3</sup> from the most ancient times, and that it survived continuously and did not merely spring up sporadically in times of stress is proved by the continuity of a recognised technique from the earliest to the latest period.

In the nature of the case it is almost impossible to reinforce these general arguments by appeal to archaeology. It is true that on one or two sites a suspiciously large number of infant burials have been found; for example, at Hambledon in Bucks the burials of 97 infants, mostly newly born, were found in the excavation of a Roman villa (*Archaeologia* LXXI.), and among 570 archaic graves examined by Orsi at Gela (*Monumenti Antichi* XVII., p. 242) 233 were *ἐγχυτρισμοί* of infants. This latter instance is accepted by Wilamowitz as proving exposure, but we have to reckon with the probability of an extremely high infant mortality

in ancient times.<sup>4</sup> It is curious that at Gela in the fifth-century cemetery only 6 *ἐγχυτρισμοί* were found out of a total of 192 burials.

The evidence dealt with hitherto will be supplemented in what follows by sources drawn upon for another purpose, the illustration of public opinion on the subject of exposure. I propose to assume the practice as proved for antiquity in general, and also that the conditions in which it was found in various parts of the ancient world were so essentially similar as to make it legitimate to combine documents bearing on different times and places.

In contrast to the more sophisticated customs of abortion and simple infanticide exposure bears the marks of a very primitive origin in the fact that the child is exposed alive. The parents who are willing to leave their child to perish by cold or hunger or by the attack of wild beasts are nevertheless unwilling to stain their hands with kindred blood. They are moreover untroubled, clearly, by any moral or theological scruples. The child as a product of the year's increase is dealt with hardly differently from the other young things of the household. This attitude is rooted in the conditions of primitive life. In the most favourable circumstances it would be impossible for any family to maintain all the children which it could bring into the world even if the mother were capable of nursing more than one at a time. Family limitation being a necessity, infanticide is the method for securing it among primitive peoples of modern as well as ancient times. We have, of course, no direct evidence for the practice in primitive Greece, but there is abundant indirect evidence in mythological tales and legends which are too familiar to need recounting that it was an accepted method of disposing of unwanted children. In these tales there is no trace of any moral reprobation of exposure in itself. It is to be noted, however, that the exposure motif is combined as a rule with the theme of the father's fear of his son or the ruler's

<sup>1</sup> Euripides, *Ion* 27.

<sup>2</sup> I have not thought it worth while to discuss the interpretation of *ἐγχυτρίσις* in *Wasps* 289. The scholiast connects it with the practice of exposure *ἐν χύτρῃ*, and I see no reason to doubt that the verb might have had its meaning extended to adults. The exact meaning of *ἐγχυτρίστρια* is more doubtful (*v. Bolkestein*).

<sup>3</sup> It is known historically in Babylonia and is found in the tales of Moses and Sargon as well as in Greek mythology.

<sup>4</sup> For this *v. Arist. Hist. An.* VII., 588a 8.

fear of a successor, as in the tales of Oedipus, Paris, and Jason. There is no doubt that this latter theme had its origin in more than mere fancy, but for our present argument it is enough to point out that the method of disposing of the dangerous child implies the practice of exposure at the time when the myths originated.

In the historical period the economic reasons for exposure persisted and were from time to time reinforced, as in the Hellenistic period by the prevalence of a hedonistic philosophy and in the fourth century A.D. by unusual stress of circumstances. At the same time, however, we have to reckon on the one hand with the development of more civilised methods of family limitation and on the other hand with the growth of a powerful opinion against infanticide in any form. That, in spite of these changes, exposure and infanticide in other forms were not only practised but also publicly recognised is clear not only from the evidence of Roman law, which has been mentioned, but also from Greek law, religion, and philosophy. Thus for example in the Law of Gortyn (III. 44 to IV. 23) regulations are laid down governing the fate of a child born of divorced parents. The child must be brought to the father within three days and, if he refuses it, ἐπὶ τῇ μητρὶ ἔμεινεν τὸ τέκνον ἢ τράπειν ἢ ἀποθῆμεν. Similarly in the Hellenistic law of Egypt after the death of a husband a marriage-contract is annulled and the widow is empowered to expose her expected child (*B.G.U.* 1104). So also infanticide by strangulation is explicitly recognised in the emancipation document *B.C.H.* 1893, p. 384, No. 80. The clear conclusions to be drawn from these documents are strongly supported by several ritual inscriptions from various parts of the Greek world which prescribe periods of purification after the incurring of ritual impurity. These periods of purification or abstinence from public worship are not to be regarded as a punishment for sin; they apply to various incidents of everyday life, involving a physical rather than a moral impurity. Most important for our purpose is an inscription of Ptolemais (Plaumann, *Ptolemais*

in *Oberägypten*, Leipzig, 1910, p. 57), where among the impurities listed are abortion and exposure. That these are not regarded as abnormal or criminal is sufficiently proved by the fact that birth itself, even if the child is to be reared, involves a period of purification. The inscription unfortunately is mutilated, but the relevant part is clear:

ἐκτροσμοῦ μὲν  
τὴν δὲ τεκοῦσαν καὶ τρέφουσαν - -  
ἐάν δὲ ἐχθρὸν τὸ βρέφος[ - -

This appears to be the only such inscription in which exposure is expressly mentioned, but abortion occurs in others (*e.g.*, *Ditt. Syll.* 983 and 1042).

The documents just quoted may be taken to illustrate the unreflecting attitude of the ordinary man. When we turn to the literary sources we find, however, that this attitude even in pagan times did not go unchallenged. Along with the tendency to rationalise popular practice and to accept it as a useful means to a political end we shall find with the gradual fusion of philosophy and religion a growing tendency to regard the question in an entirely different light, until with the victory of Christianity humanitarian views gain a complete theoretical victory. In his political writings Plato assumed, as was recalled above, that the size of the state must be limited; the citizens of the first state (*Rep.* 372b) are to limit their families, οὐχ ὑπὲρ τὴν οὐσίαν ποιοῦμενοι τοὺς παῖδας εὐλαβούμενοι πενίαν ἢ πόλεμον, and in the ideal state infanticide and exposure are clearly envisaged as a means of maintaining the purity of the population (459d ff.). Again, in the *Laws* he proposes to limit the family to two (*XI.* 930c), παίδων δὲ ἱκανότης ἀκριβὴς ἄρρην καὶ θήλειαν ἔστω τῷ νόμῳ, and to maintain a fixed number of households. If there is a surplus or a deficiency of children, μηχαναὶ εἰσὶν πολλαί (*V.* 740). Already in Aristotle we see signs of a change. He agrees about the importance of limiting population in the ideal state (*Pol.* VII. 4, 4), and suggests that regulations for limitation should be fixed by calculating the chances of mortality in children and of sterility in married persons (*II.* 6, 13): but he does not commit himself to a definite method of limitation, and says

that abortion may have to be resorted to if feeling is averse to exposure. The passage reads as follows in Jowett's translation (VII. 16, 15): 'As to the exposure and rearing of children, let there be a law that no deformed child shall live, but where there are too many (for in our state population has a limit), when couples have children in excess, and the state of feeling is averse to the exposure of offspring, let abortion be procured before life and sense have begun; what may or may not be lawfully done in these cases depends on the question of life and sensation.' This passage is important since it seems to prove that by the time of Aristotle a rational objection was felt in certain circles to family limitation by exposure of the child alive. This feeling, however, cannot simply be equated with the religious feeling which becomes prominent later, since Aristotle implies that it was tolerant of abortion. It is clear further, however, and this is important, that this passage reflects certain questionings about the morality even of abortion. We know that this method must have been common much earlier, and we know also that in certain quarters it must have been regarded with disfavour because participation in operations of this kind was forbidden in the medical writings of Hippocrates. The division of opinion was reflected in interesting discussions of the physical nature and moral rights of the embryo, of which we have traces for example in Plutarch, *De Placitis Philosophorum* (V. 15), *Εἰ τὸ ἔμβρυον ζῶν*. Philo (*De Special. Legg.*, p. 318, Mangey) also alludes to the theory of the *φυσικοί* that the foetus is merely part of the mother in order to prove infanticide *a fortiori* sinful, since violence causing abortion is punishable by death in *Exodus* (XXI. 18).

There is not much evidence for philosophical opinion after Plato and Aristotle, but it seems to have followed the lines we should expect. Philosophers of a Cynic cast no doubt regarded family relationships as merely another unnatural convention. Democritus, though he admitted that it was natural to beget children, seems to have thought that it would be more rational to adopt a child of one's own choice; and Aristippus,

*μεμφομένης αὐτῷ τῆς γυναικὸς ὅτι τὸν υἱὸν οὐ προσίεται καὶ λεγούσης ὅτι ἐκ σοῦ εἴη, ἀποπτύσας* Καὶ γὰρ τοῦτο, εἶπεν, ἐξ ἐμοῦ ἀλλ' οὐδέν μοι χρήσιμόν ἐστιν. Even the Stoic Seneca, if he is to be reckoned a Stoic, approves of the exposure at least of deformed children, though that of course is a special case (*De Ira* I. 15, 2). The Stoics, however, on the whole seem to have been strongly influenced by the religious opinion which is now to be traced.

In Plato's account of the underworld at the end of the *Republic* we have a brief description of the punishment of sin, which concludes thus: *τῶν δὲ εὐθὺς γενομένων καὶ ὀλίγον χρόνον βιούντων περὶ ἄλλα ἔλεγεν οὐκ ἄξια μνήμης. εἰς δὲ θεοὺς ἀσεβείας τε καὶ εὐσεβείας καὶ γονέας καὶ αὐτόχειρος φόνου μείζους ἔτι τοὺς μισθοὺς διηγείτο*. It has long been recognised that the inclusion of infants among those whose fate in the underworld was particularly gloomy was a conventional part of Orphic eschatology. In Virgil we again find the *ἄωροι* (*Aen.* VI. 426),

*quos dulcis uitae exsortes et ab ubere raptos abstulit una dies et funere mersit acerbo,*

and here they are coupled with the *βιαιοθάνατοι*, those who have met a violent death by execution, suicide, or a crime of passion. Both classes are excluded from the real Hades itself. Unlike the *ἄταφοι* they have crossed the Acheron, but they cannot be admitted either to Tartarus or to Elysium. That these conceptions were current and familiar appears clearly from Lucian, who in his mock *Catabasis* parodies the religious terminology (e.g. *οἱ ἀκλανστοί*) and introduces as one of the standard categories the children who are too young to answer their names to Clotho. Hermes, the embarkation officer, passes them over to Charon in a mass (*Catabasis* V.): *ἰδοῦ σοι ὃ πορθμεὺ τὸν ἀριθμὸν οὗτοι τριακόσιοι μετὰ τῶν ἐκτεθειμένων*. So also in Plutarch (*De Genio Socratis* 590 f.) the wailing of children (*μυρίων κλαυθμὸν βρεφῶν*) is heard in the pit of Hades. If we had nothing to rely on but the passage from Lucian and the evidence for the practice we should be justified in concluding that exposure contributed largely to the

number of *ἄωροι*, but this assumption is considerably strengthened by the fact that in literature belonging to the same tradition exposure, infanticide, and abortion are specifically condemned. In a list of sinners, for example, the *Oracula Sibyllina* (II. 280, Geffcken) mention

δοσαι ἐνὶ γαστέρι φόρους  
ἐκτρώσκουσιν, δοσαι τε τόκους ῥίπτουσιν ἀθέσμως,

and again (III. 762):

μοιχείας πεφύλαξο καὶ ἄρσενος ἀκριτον εὐνήν  
τὴν δ' ἴδιαν γένναν παίδων τρέφε μὴδὲ φόνευσ.  
ταῦτα γὰρ ἀθάνατος κεχολώσεται δις κεν ἁμάρτη.

The same prohibitions occur in Pseudo-Phocylides (185 Bergk):

μὴδὲ γυνὴ φθελροὶ βρέφοι ἐμβρυον ἐνδοθι γαστρός,  
μὴδὲ τεκούσα κυσὶν ῥίψῃ καὶ γυνὴν ἐλωρα.  
μὴδ' ἐπὶ σῇ ἀλόχῃ ἐγκύμονι χεῖρα βάλληαι.

It can hardly be doubted that there is a connexion of thought between the prohibition of infanticide and the Orphic view of the fate of the *ἄωροι*, which we have found as early as Plato. This view is bound up with the whole Orphic system; it implies a firm belief in a soul separate and immortal and in a normal cycle of life and death. The *ἄωροι* and *βιαιοθάνατοι* are consigned to a special place because their deaths are unnatural, they have not fulfilled the allotted and normal span. This appears clearly in Tertullian (*De Anima* 56), who, like Virgil and others, is thought to be drawing on a late Stoic source: *aiunt et immatura morte praeventas eo usque uagari istic donec reliquatio compleatur aetatum, quas tum peruixissent, si non intempestive obiissent*. This doctrine involves a moral point of view on infanticide entirely different from that of the ordinary man, and we can trace signs of defence against attack from this side in the discussions regarding the nature of the embryo and in Philo's statement that οἱ πολλοί consider that a baby that has not tasted τροφῆς ἡμέρου is not ἄνθρωπος (*De Vit. Mos.*, Mangey II., p. 82).

It seems justifiable to assume on the evidence just considered that within paganism itself we can trace the development of a morality which condemned infanticide and that this morality is closely bound up with certain pagan eschatological ideas. As this is a point

of some importance it may be permitted to reinforce the argument still further. It is well known that Stoicism in its later development was strongly influenced by religion of the mystical type, and that there is strong reason to believe that, like Cicero in the *Somnium Scipionis*, Virgil in the *Aeneid* drew largely on a Stoic source, probably Posidonius. If then it appears that in Stoicism of the later stamp exposure and infanticide were condemned we shall have reason to suppose that the condemnation is in the same line of tradition as the eschatology. For the proof it is sufficient to look at Musonius Rufus. He condemns the rich who *τολμῶσι τὰ ἐπιγινόμενα τέκνα μὴ τρέφειν, ἵνα τὰ προγενόμενα εὐπορῇ μᾶλλον* (Hense, p. 80), and he praises the lawgivers who have encouraged *πολυπαιδία* (p. 77): *δρῶμεν δ' ἂν ἐναντία τὴν πολυπαιδίαν τὴν ἑαυτῶν κωλύοντες, πῶς δ' οὐχὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς πατρώους θεοὺς ἑξαμαρτάνοιμεν ἂν καὶ εἰς τὸν ὁμόγνιον Δία ταῦτα πράττοντες*; This appeal to the *πατῆρες θεοί* and to *Ζεὺς ὁμόγνιος* recalls a papyrus fragment probably of a Stoic text (Mahaffy, *Flinders Petrie Pap.* XLIX. e III): *τὰ τέκνα μὴ ἀποκτείνειν ἵνα μὴ συμβῇ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον αὐτῶ τὰ ὁμόφυλα ἀπεκτονηκέναι*. Hierocles, another Stoic, contemporary with Musonius, agrees in this condemnation, though with a certain concession to the popular practice: *κατὰ φύσιν γὰρ πως καὶ ἀκόλουθον τῷ γάμῳ τὸ πάντα ἢ τά γε πλεῖστα τῶν γεννωμένων ἀνατρέφειν*. In this context we should range Philo, who seems to be influenced by Stoicism in his view that children have a natural right to live; parents who expose their children *ἴστωσαν νόμους φύσεως καταλύοντες* (*De Spec. Legg.*, Mangey, p. 318). It seems clear then that in the later Stoicism we can find religious teaching combining with the more rational humanitarianism that characterised the school to bring about a strong feeling against infanticide. A precise parallel can be found in the history of opinion on suicide. Early Stoicism appears to have permitted it; the later school, influenced by the tendencies under discussion, forbade it. That there was in Greek public opinion from an early period a basis for the development of



this moral attitude has already been indicated. The history of medical ethics seems to show rather unexpectedly a growing lack of scruple in the use of means of abortion, and it is in the Greek period that we find the strictest attitude. An authority on the subject<sup>1</sup> concludes: 'Der Gesamteindruck ist unbestreitbar der, dass die wissenschaftliche Medizin der Hippokratiker mit den φθόρια nichts zu tun hat und zu tun haben will und dass sie auch prophylaktisch nicht abortieren lässt.'

Is it possible then to conclude that on this subject Greek ethical thought pursued an entirely independent line of development and by itself formed the basis of the Christian attitude? Before we examine the evidence for external influences it will be advisable to show the close relationship between early Christian thought and Greek ethics as represented in Stoics and the Orphic religion. The point at which pagan religion and early Christianity make the closest contact is in the realm of Apocalyptic, and we find that the ἄωροι of the pagan Hades appear but little altered in the Christian hell, for which the main early Christian source is the Apocalypse of Peter. There we find (26, Dieterich *Nekyia*, p. 6) the unnatural mothers suffering the punishment of their crime: *κακεὶ ἐκάθητο γυναῖκες ἔχουσαι τὸν ἰχῶρα μέχρι τῶν τραχήλων καὶ ἀντικρὺς αὐτῶν πολλοὶ παῖδες, οἵτινες ἄωροι ἐτίκτοντο, καθήμενοι ἐκλαιον, καὶ προήρχοντο ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀκτίνες πυρὸς καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας ἐπληρσσαν κατὰ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν, αὗται δὲ ἦσαν αἱ ἄγαμοι συλλαβοῦσαι καὶ ἐκτρώσασαι. A further fragment bears witness to exposure (Clement, *Eclog.* 41, cf. 48): ἡ γραφή φησι τὰ βρέφη τὰ ἐκτεθέντα Τημελοῦχῳ παραδίδοσθαι ἀγγέλῳ, ὃς οὐ παιδεύεσθαι τε καὶ αὔξειν. According to James (*J. Th. S.* XII., 1911, p. 373) two groups appeared in the Apocalypse: (a) Aborted children, who are present and assist at the punishment of their mothers and for whom therefore no better fate can be found; (b) children*

exposed to death, who are delivered to the angel Temlākos (Ethiopic version). This apocalyptic tradition appears much later in the Apocalypse of Paul (Tischendorf, *Apocalypses Apocryphae*, Lipsiae, 1866, p. 60), in the Apocalypse of Esra (*ib.*, p. 29), and in the vision reported by Boniface (Norden, *Aeneis* VI., p. 14).

There are two main points to notice in this apocalyptic tradition. The first is that the connexion between the ἄωροι and exposure and infanticide is quite explicit, a fact which increases the probability that the same connexion is to be looked for in the pagan literature. The second is that the moral attitude is governed by eschatological theory; it is not so much the inhumanity of the mothers which arouses horror as the fate of the child, particularly in the later period of the unbaptised child in the underworld limbo. This attitude of mind we have already traced in the pagan Orphic tradition. In the Christian apologists, on the other hand, this motif is not in the forefront. In other words we have in Christianity two different attitudes which correspond to the two which have been indicated in paganism. One side of the parallelism has been illustrated; it is easy to show the strong resemblance on the other side between the practical humanitarianism of the Stoics such as Musonius and the Christian apologists to the Gentiles. Prohibition of infanticide and abortion was a feature of Christian morals from the start. The *Didache* (II. 2) says οὐ φονεύσεις τέκνον ἐν φθορᾷ οὐδὲ γεννηθέντα ἀποκτενεῖς, and practically the same words occur in Barnabas (*Epist.* XIX. 5) and in the *Constitutiones Apostolicae* (VII. 3, 2). The apologists and fathers<sup>2</sup> unanimously take up the condemnation of pagan society, but they argue on the humanitarian basis, which was common ground at the time. In the earliest writers there is a distinct note of sincerity, but at a later date the

<sup>1</sup> Ilberg in *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* XIII. (1910), p. 1, 'Zur gynäkologischen Ethik der Griechen.'

<sup>2</sup> Minucius Felix XXXI.; Tertullian, *ad Nationes* I. 15; Ambrose, *de Nebuthe* V. 21, *Hexamer.* V. 18; August. *Ep.* XCVIII.; Lactant. *Inst. Div.* VI. 20; Justin, *Apol.* I. 27; *Epistula ad Diogn.* 5; Athenagoras XXXIII.; Origen, *contra Celsum* VIII. 55; Clem. Alex., *Paedag.* III. 3.



denunciations are not entirely based on experience. A comparison of St. Basil (*Homily VI. 4*) with St. Ambrose (*De Tobia 8*) will show that the fathers were willing victims of the literary commonplace.

On one question which is of some interest in modern as well as in ancient times there is a remarkable coincidence in pagan and Christian thought. Not only did the early Christians condemn abortion and exposure, but they denounced the theory that sexual intercourse was in itself wicked if not indulged in with a view to *παιδοποιία*, and thus originated the attitude of the Church on family limitation by birth control. The position is clearly stated in Athenagoras (33): *καὶ ἡμῖν μέτρον ἐπιθυμίας ἡ παιδοποιία*, and in *Const. Apost.* (VI. 28, 3): *ἡ τε πορνεία φθορὰ τῆς οἰκείας ἐστὶ σαρκός, οὐκ ἐπὶ παιδοποιᾷ γιγνομένη ἀλλ' ἡδονῇ χαριζομένη τὸ πᾶν*. The same sentiment is found in Musonius (Hense, p. 63): *χρὴ δὲ τοὺς μὴ τρυφῶντας ἢ μὴ κακοὺς μόνα μὲν ἀφροδίσια νομίζειν δίκαια τὰ ἐν γάμῳ καὶ ἐπὶ γενέσει παίδων συντελούμενα, ὅτι καὶ νόμιμά ἐστι. τὰ δὲ γε ἡδονὴν θηρώμενα ψιλὴν ἄδिका καὶ παράνομα κἂν ἐν γάμῳ ᾖ*. So also Philo describes parents who expose their children as like beasts that copulate for pleasure (*De Spec. Legg.*, p. 318, Mangey). To try to trace the origin of this peculiar idea would lead far beyond the bounds of this inquiry; it is enough to say that here again we can trace in Greek thought itself one contributory source. The feeling that sexual intercourse entails ritual impurity appears not only in the prescriptions for ritual purification which have been cited above, but also in numerous confession inscriptions which record the punishment sent from heaven on those who had violated the ordinances of their God (e.g. Ramsay, *C.B.* p. 151, No. 46).

The case thus made out for Greek influence in moulding Christian opinion on infanticide is strong, but it is necessary to consider whether other sources may not also have contributed. It may be admitted at once that documents like the *Oracula Sibyllina* and Pseudo-Phocylides on which we have relied in tracing Orphic tradition are open to the suspicion of contamination from

Christian or Jewish sources, and to the Jews some inquirers have in fact looked for the origin of the Christian attitude. Wide, for example, attacking Reinach, who had argued for Orphic influence, appealed to the passage in Josephus, *Contra Apionem* (II. 24, 4): *γυναιξὶν ἀπέειπε (ὁ νόμος) μὴτ' ἀμβλοῦν τὸ σπάρην μήτε διαφθεῖρειν ἄλλη μηχανῇ τεκνοκτόνος γὰρ ἂν εἴη, ψυχὴν ἀφανίζουσα καὶ τὸ γένος ἐλαττοῦσα*. To rest a case on this passage is extremely rash. Not only is the *Contra Apionem* a notorious 'Tendenzschrift,' but there is no such prohibition in the Bible, and the statement of Josephus can be traced to a Hellenistic source which is not above suspicion. In Diodorus (XL. 3) we find: *τεκνοτροφεῖν τε ἠνάγκαζε τοὺς ἐπὶ τῆς χώρας καὶ δι' ὀλίγης δαπάνης ἐκτρεφόμενων τῶν βρεφῶν αἰεὶ τὸ γένος τῶν Ἰουδαίων ὑπῆρχε πολυάνθρωπον*. So also in Tacitus<sup>1</sup>: *augendae tamen multitudini consulitur; nam et necare quæquam ex adgnatis nefas*, etc. Echoes of the same tradition are found in the passage of Musonius already quoted where he praises the law-givers (i.e., Moses among others) who have encouraged *πολυπαιδία*. The source of Diodorus is Hecataeus of Abdera, one of the first Greek writers to describe the Jews and their customs (c. 300 B.C.). Now Hecataeus unfortunately is one of the line of writers who in describing foreign countries were inclined to find a beauty and purity of morals which might put their readers to shame, and we know that he found a suitable outlet for his talents in writing a work on the Hyperboreans. Moreover, he treated of the Jews in connexion with the Egyptians, and curiously enough he reports the same custom of them (*τὰ γεννώμενα πάντα τρέφουσιν*, Diod. I. 80) and gives the same reason, *τρέφονται δὲ τὰ παιδιά μετὰ τινοῦ εὐχερείας ἰδαπάνου καὶ παντελῶς ἀπίστου*. Strabo draws on the same source when he says (XVII. 2, 5): *τοῦτο δὲ τῶν μάλιστα ζηλουμένων παρ' αὐτοῖς, τὸ πάντα τρέφειν τὰ γεννώμενα παιδιά*. Hecataeus himself appears to have drawn on Aristotle if we can trust the quotation in Oribasius (*Arist. frag.* 258): *περὶ τῶν ὀκταμήνων*

<sup>1</sup> *Hist. V. 5.*

εἰσὶ τινες οἱ φασιν οὐθὲν ζῆν. τοῦτο δὲ ἐστὶ ψεῦδος· ζῆ γάρ, καὶ τοῦτο μάλιστα μὲν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ δῆλον διὰ τὸ τρέφειν πάντα τὰ γινόμενα τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους.

One conclusion to be drawn from this evidence is clear. The writers subsequent to Aristotle who report the custom are drawing not on experience but on literary tradition, and the custom itself appears as a commonplace in the descriptions of foreign lands with a moral tendency. Hence we are not surprised to find that Tacitus uses of the Germans almost the same language that he uses of the Jews (*Germania* 19): *numerum liberorum finire aut quemquam ex agnatis necare flagitium habetur*.<sup>1</sup> Even so, however, this evidence is not without importance. It helps to confirm the conclusion reached on other grounds that in the Greek world itself there was a certain public opinion against infanticide; these reports are in effect criticisms of Greek practice, and the popularity of the theme of *πολυπαιδία* is no doubt due to a real anxiety about the desolation of Greece compared with the fecundity of Judaea and Egypt.

It is clear then that we must regard acquaintance with the Jews and Egyptians as stimulating Greek thought rather than as furnishing it with any new principles. This conclusion is confirmed by an examination of other evidence produced from Jewish sources. Wide (p. 231) quotes the Talmud to show that a certain Rabbi condemned abortion, but the Rabbi appears to have lived in the second century A.D., by which time there can be no question of independence of Greek thought. The same consideration applies to Philo, who is steeped in Greek philosophy; and even to the Wisdom of Solomon, which has been quoted in this connexion (III. 16, etc.), though the passages there probably refer to ritual sacrifice rather than to ordinary infanticide. It seems legitimate then to conclude that,

however their practice may have differed from that of the Greeks, the Jews made no specific contribution to ethical thought on this subject, and that when we find infanticide condemned in the earliest Gentile Christianity the source of the moral attitude should be sought in the line of tradition for which the evidence is clear—that is, in Greek philosophy and religion.

The main object of this paper is now fulfilled. We have seen that the views of pagan moralists like Musonius coincided with those of the Christians, and from this time onwards there is no rational defence of infanticide except in the special case of deformed children, and even that soon disappears. Seneca, we have seen, mentions the practice as rational, and Curtius in a romantic account of the Indians attributes to them the ancient custom of Sparta (IX. 1, 25); but these appear to be the last traces of the eugenic tradition. It must not be supposed, however, that the theoretical victory of humanitarianism was accompanied by practical success. The thunders of the Fathers passed over the head of the ordinary man, and, if space permitted, it would be possible to show from Roman law, the records of Church Councils, and other sources, that the practice of exposure persisted into mediaeval and even, in disguised forms, into modern times. The reasons for the imperfect practical success of Christian morality cannot be fully considered here, but two points may be briefly indicated. Exposure and infanticide were undoubtedly to a large extent the result of economic pressure, and Christianity did nothing to mitigate this beyond inculcating a standard of self-control amounting almost to an expulsion of nature. In the second place, the ethics of Christianity, derived as they were from a pagan origin, had only an accidental connexion with rational humanitarianism; they are rooted in a pre-Christian eschatological system and in certain primitive beliefs with regard to sex. An ethical system which pivoted thus on the unknown, and which failed to reckon with the real roots of the practice which it condemned, was badly fitted to maintain an entirely success-

<sup>1</sup> This same *locus communis* is used of the Picts (τὰ γεννόμενα πάντα κοινῶς ἐκτρέφοντες Dio Cass. LXXVI. 12) and of the Etruscans (τρέφειν τοὺς Τυρρηνοὺς πάντα τὰ γινόμενα παιδία Theopompus in Athen. XII. 517d). Kornemann, *Die Stellung der Frau*, etc. (p. 29 ff.) takes these passages seriously.

ful struggle with the world and the flesh.

Attention has been concentrated here on a single problem, but, even so, the intricacy of the inquiry makes it impossible to hope that every conclusion drawn is correct. Other important

topics—for example, the causes and results of infanticide and the fate of the exposed child—have been left untouched and are reserved for treatment on another occasion.

A. CAMERON.

University of Aberdeen.

### THREE NEW LINES OF LUCAN.

In the C.R. for 1930 (XLIV, p. 174) I called attention to the probable importance of British Museum Additional MS. 14799 (saec. XIV-XV, in an Italian hand) as an authority for the reconstruction of Lucan's text. I have since noted that Francken printed *obstrinxit* in the text of his edition, and also that Professor Ed. Fraenkel of Freiburg im Breisgau found this reading in a Florentine MS., Laur. 35, 17 (saec. XII) (*Gnomon* II [1926], p. 560, n. 1).

But, though the text of Book VII is known to be disturbed to an exceptional extent among the books of Lucan, I was certainly not prepared to find in this British Museum MS. three lines which, to the best of my belief, have never been observed by an editor or appeared in print.

I give a little of the context, printing the new lines in their place in italics:

ego sum cui Marte peracto  
quae populi regesque tenent donare licebit. 300  
quone poli motu, quo caeli sidere uerso  
Thessalicae tantum, superi, permittitis orae?  
aut merces hodie bellorum aut poena parata.  
*ne uos hispani mitis uictoria martis*  
*securus habeat dedimusque ruraeque urbes*  
*et quicquid nobis post gallica bella negatum.*

Caesareas spectate cruces, spectate catenas,  
et caput hoc positum rostris effusaque mem-  
bra  
Saeptorumque nefas et clausi proelia Campi. 305

The second of the new lines is of course metrically defective and corrupt. I suggest that the first *que* should be really *quae*, but I leave to others the restoration of the true form of the line. The lines as a whole seem to me certainly Lucanic, and, if this view be accepted, the MS. is at once lifted into a place of the greatest importance. That a late Italian MS. might provide what far older MSS. have lost will not be denied by those who remember Mr. Winstedt's discovery of lost lines in Juvenal's *Satires*; and two other instances of the same phenomenon have emerged from my own study of late Latin authors, 'Ambrosiaster' and Pelagius.

My complete collation of this, as well as of the other British Museum MS. to which I alluded in my previous note, is already far advanced, and will, I hope, be the subject of a later study.

A. SOUTER.

University of Aberdeen.

## REVIEWS

### THE EARLY AGE OF GREECE.

*The Early Age of Greece.* By SIR WILLIAM RIDGEWAY. Vol. II. Edited by A. S. F. GOW and D. S. ROBERTSON. Pp. xxviii + 747. Cambridge: University Press, 1931. Cloth, 30s.

*The Earlier Religion of Greece in the Light of Cretan Discoveries.* By SIR ARTHUR EVANS. Frazer Lecture for 1931 in the University of Cambridge. Pp. 42. London: Macmillan, 1931. Boards, 2s. 6d.

OF these two books the smaller brings us the most recent contribution to one of the problems set us by early Greece, but both of them, Sir William Ridgeway's posthumous tome of nearly 800 pages and Sir Arthur Evans' Frazer Lecture of hardly more than 40, carry us back also to the beginnings of these studies some thirty-five years ago. Evans looks back to a British Association paper on the primitive religion of

prehistoric Greece, read in 1896, and to his *Mycenaean Tree and Pillar Cult*, first read to the Hellenic Society in 1900, and published finally in 1901. It was in 1901, too, that Ridgeway published the first volume of the work of which we now welcome the second, more than five years after his death, and this book harks back again to the foundations laid in his paper *What People produced the Objects called Mycenaean?* which appeared in the *J.H.S.* in 1896. It was in 1894 that Evans published his discovery of the Cretan script; Phylakopi in Melos, the first important Bronze Age site in the Aegaeon to be excavated in any way adequately, was dug from 1895 to 1897; the first season of the great work at Knossos was in 1900. These excavations were a symptom of the interest of scholars in the problems of early Greece, and with his article in 1896 Ridgeway was early in the field. And it should be noted that his article, though printed only in 1896, was in fact written earlier. What is now orthodoxy was then so heretical that it was not easy for Ridgeway even to get a hearing in print.

That justice should be done to Ridgeway's originality the exact year is of importance. Until then the orthodox view was that the Bronze Age civilisation which had come to light at Mycenae and elsewhere, and was whispered of in Crete, was the work of the Homeric Achaeans, the first Aryan invaders of Greece. But in 1896 two important voices were heard at the British Association. Evans declared that the roots of Mycenaean art were deeply set in Aegaeon soil: Ridgeway was at last able to get publicity for his paper claiming this art, not for the Achaeans, but as a native product of the Aegaeon and the work of the mysterious Pelasgians. Too much has perhaps been made of Ridgeway's identification of the makers of Mycenaean art with the Pelasgians, a word also which Myres has pointed out was used by the ancients themselves in more than one sense. But in the essential point in which Ridgeway challenged the then orthodox view he was correct: no one has been found now for many years who would deny the Aegaeon origin of the culture of Mycenae.

And even for the word *Pelasgian* it may be said that, if any ancient Greek had wondered who built the walls of Tiryns or the Lion Gate of Mycenae, he would hardly have made any other answer to himself than that they were works of the Pelasgians, or perhaps of the Cyclopes. Also in his belief in the earliness of the Greek language in Greece Ridgeway is in line with the most modern conjectures.

These views were developed in the first volume of *The Early Age of Greece*. Ridgeway was a busy man, and he was also a great accumulator of material. He viewed the development of at least European mankind as a unity, and thus he was always supporting his case by fresh parallels from all parts of the world, notably from his own country, Ireland. This compelled him to produce other books: *The Thoroughbred Horse* in 1905; *The Origin of Tragedy* in 1910; *Drama and Dramatic Dances* in 1915; and with these substantial books a great number of smaller papers; and the second volume of *The Early Age*, though always on the way, never appeared. Then in 1927 Ridgeway died, and his papers were taken in hand by the present editors, whom we have to thank for this very substantial volume. Another of Ridgeway's old pupils, Mr. A. J. B. Wace, has written the introduction, which after all these years is necessary to define Ridgeway's position with regard to the problems of early Greece. We thus now have four more long chapters: *Kinship and Marriage* in 304 pages; *Murder and Homicide*; *Fetish, 'Totem,' and Ancestor*; and lastly 210 pages on *Ireland in the Heroic Age*. For all their mass of fresh material these chapters do not present any views not already to be found in the first volume; their purpose is to strengthen by additional evidence what was all through Ridgeway's main thesis: namely that there was in all ways a wide and essential difference between those older inhabitants of Greece who produced the Mycenaean culture and the later people whom we first see as the Achaeans of Homer. With this as his central thread the author gives full rein to the wide discursiveness that was so characteristic of his writing and con-



versation. The chapter, for example, on *Murder and Homicide* is devoted to showing that there were two systems in Greece of dealing with the slaying of man, the relentless vengeance for blood and the payment of a compensation, and that the former was the earlier of the two, and corresponded to the Mycenaean culture.

To the reader of today much of this is proving what is now universally admitted. This is the necessary fate of the pioneer, the man who was right when a great part of the world was wrong. Ridgeway's views were at first heresies; now after thirty years argument in their favour seems superfluous. The production, too, of this gigantic mass of material, for we must remember that the other books of these later years would have kept lesser men fully occupied, to say nothing of his incessant labours as a teacher, prevented Ridgeway from casting his eyes upon the sides of the Aegaeon problem which are now so much to the fore: notably the relation between the Cretan culture and that phase of the Aegaeon civilisation found at Mycenae and other mainland sites. Ridgeway was the last man to ask for any indulgence, but it would be vain not to realise that his ever-increasing deficiency of eyesight made it very hard for him to keep up with the later discoveries and problems. But this is far from saying that this volume, like too many posthumous books, is out of date before it is published. The arguments are old, but the material by which they are supported is of the greatest interest. Also the close contact with a mind like Ridgeway's must of itself be a pleasure and an advantage.

It is a duty to acknowledge the zeal and labour which the editors have put into their very difficult task. They have paid in generous measure the pious debt to Ridgeway's memory which everyone who has been taught

by him must always feel. They do no more than hint at the difficulties which they have had to face: the present reviewer has every reason to believe that they must have been immense. The result shows that it was worth the pains they have spent, and much thanks is due to them, and to Mr. Wace for his introduction. The general appearance of the book, a point to which Ridgeway always paid great attention, is admirable.

In the religion of the Bronze Age Ridgeway was perhaps not very deeply interested: their social customs and their material outfit, weapons and so on, were what appealed to him most, perhaps as being the more tangible. Evans, on the other hand, has always shown himself an eager and sympathetic student of their religious ideas, and in this Frazer Lecture he gives us the latest development of his thought on the subject. He lets us see as much difference between the Minoans and what is characteristic of the later Greeks as even Ridgeway would like to find. Of the human, material character of the Olympian gods, no trace; rather we see a symbolic outlet for the religious instinct and an appreciation of the kindly fertility of nature embodied in the form of a goddess and her son or consort. So far the Minoans do not stand alone: what impresses us is that, with a way of treating religion which frequently opens a way to the grossest license, no trace of anything of the sort has been observed in the remains we have left of their cult. The gods of the Greek religion are human, neither worse nor better: the Minoan notion of divinity was one which, if it can rise above, very often falls to the lowest levels possible; the Minoans seem not to have fallen.

The lecture is admirably illustrated.

R. M. DAWKINS.

Exeter College, Oxford.

#### WANDERINGS IN GREECE.

*Wanderings in Greece.* By F. S. BURNELL. Pp. 253; 16 photographs on 10 plates, 2 maps (on end-papers). London: Arnold, 1931. Cloth, 7s. 6d.

In the Foreword to this book the author says: 'Apart from the fact that no guide-book for Greece has been published in English since the War, to

visit Greece with a guide-book as one's sole source of information is to miss at least half the interest of the country, while to travel with a complete reference-library is obviously out of the question.' We may accordingly demand how far this book combines the functions of an up-to-date guide-book and a portable work of reference to supplement the guide-book portions which it contains; and thereby supplies a real want for the intelligent traveller in Greece. It is certainly portable, it is nicely got up, and illustrated with a few well-chosen photographs; we must admit that some of them appear rather woolly round the edges, and that the only maps, on the end-papers of each cover, are more decorative than helpful. As, however, the only ancient sites visited outside Attica consist of Megara, Corinth, Aegina, Mycenae, Argos, Tiryns, Olympia, Delphi and Knossos, the traveller who ventures off these familiar routes will be disappointed. We fear, moreover, that the less venturesome will find it rather unsatisfactory also. For the most part it is pleasant, if not always easy, reading, though we could dispense with occasional touches of rather ponderous levity, but readers will be well advised to be sceptical of some of the author's interpretations, and to have their guide-books (even if out of date) handy for checking details and supplying omissions. In spite of ample evidence of his industry, it would be misleading to regard his bibliography as representative, even for works in English, and such works as the *Acropolis Museum Catalogue*, Mahaffy's *Rambles and Studies*, Schuchhardt's *Schliemann*, Haigh's *Attic Theatre*, Ernest Gardner's *Greek Sculpture*, might well have replaced less useful entries. In fact we find nothing specifically on the Theatre, and only Schrader's *Pheidias* among works on Sculpture.

Turning to the text, we find the first chapter, headed 'The Dawn in the Aegean,' packed too full of information, for in twenty-one pages it strides across the centuries, from Neolithic Crete

down to Roman monuments on the Acropolis, including, incidentally, three pages on the tragic fall of Souli in 1821. Chapters II. (the Acropolis) and IX. (Delphi) are overburdened with minutiae of religion and mythology, and the chapters on Olympia and Knossos err in the same direction. The newcomer to Greece, noticing that references to *Zeus* occur on an average once in every sixteen pages, may legitimately wonder whether 'too many Cooks . . .,' and will, if he is wise, leave that learned work till his return home. On the other hand he may equally well complain that his more immediate needs are not sufficiently catered for. He will find that there is no systematic indication of the contents of museums, and that, except for the 'hockey-players' base, none of the important acquisitions of the National Museum which are subsequent to the date of the last English Baedeker are even hinted at; and he might reasonably expect to find some allusion to the Korai in the account of the treasures of the Acropolis. In these, and similar, shortcomings we begin to see the limitations of Mr. Burnell's reading and interests. Whilst the careful reader will find a rather long list of inaccuracies, considering the length of the book, we can only stop to notice misprints on pp. 11, 17, 165, 223, 250; for certain wrong dates it would be scarcely fair to blame the printer alone, e.g. the accession of Peisistratos, the exile of Themistokles, the destruction of 'Mycenae and Tiryns in 486.' The late H. R. Hall was not 'Professor,' and the harbour illustrated (facing p. 30) is not Piraeus but Zea. We must pass over some examples of the retention of discarded opinions, but the statement 'when Philip II. of Macedon, the father of Alexander, attacked Athens in 200 B.C. he made Kynosarges his headquarters' has a disconcerting effect, which is not removed on finding that the Index has no reference to Philip V.

A. M. WOODWARD.

University of Sheffield.

## GREECE IN THE FIFTH CENTURY.

*Histoire Ancienne, Deuxième Partie. Histoire Grecque, Tome II. La Grèce au V<sup>e</sup> Siècle.* Par GUSTAVE GLOTZ, avec la collaboration de ROBERT COHEN. Pp. 800; 11 maps. Paris: Les Presses Universitaires de France, 1929-31. Paper, 67.50 fr.

THE second volume of this French History of Greece is published in four fascicules, which are not, however, self-contained but essentially serial instalments. The merits of the first volume are well maintained: the narrative is clear and easy to read, the easier perhaps because it does not invariably indicate the existence of difficulties or differences of opinion, the discussion of which would be out of scale. But after all the writer of a general history must take his stand upon one view or the other, *e.g.* of the date of the Callias decree, though perhaps more use might have been made of the footnotes for indicating where matters of dispute arise. The book is well documented and indexed. So far as I have checked them, the references are correct, and the typographical and more serious errors which defaced the bibliography of Volume I. seem here successfully to have been avoided. The short bibliographies might sometimes be criticised as a little indiscriminate, but on the whole are excellent and useful.

The history of the fifth century is, of course, the history of Athens: that the authors have taken this view is shown by the proportions of the book. Two hundred pages sketch the political history of the period of the Persian Wars and the Fifty Years; another

two hundred are given to the Peloponnesian War. The remaining four hundred are devoted to Athenian democracy, its machinery, its economic and social life, its art and the intellectual movement which found its centre in Athens. Though this may ideally seem a little disproportionate, it perhaps lends its special value to the book, for here the general reader will find a much more detailed treatment of the social conditions and political organisation of Athens in the fifth century than is usual in general histories. So far as it repeats matter which is in the big dictionaries, it repeats them in a more attractive form, and, as every teacher knows, but few undergraduates, even if they have the linguistic equipment, will very readily browse in Pauly-Wissowa. But quite apart from the sheer information imparted, there is inevitably much here to learn about the economic and social aspect of ancient life, a field which Professor Glotz has made peculiarly his own. Of Athenian democracy he is a candid but a fair critic and shows himself appreciative of its virtues as well as conscious of its shortcomings. The whole of this part of the book is well done and will be very useful. The rest is unexceptionable and calls for little comment: it is good competent work, but naturally it does not markedly differ from good histories upon the same scale. The authors have perhaps a greater interest and consequently a greater felicity in handling foreign politics than military history.

W. R. HALLIDAY.

*King's College, London.*

## GREEK COMEDY.

*Greek Comedy.* By GILBERT NORWOOD. Pp. viii+413. London: Methuen and Co., 1931. Cloth, 12s. 6d.

IT is not quite clear for what class of readers Professor Norwood has designed this interesting book. A great part of it is well calculated to give University students most of the material facts, and the brief explanations with regard to the fragmentary Comic Poets which

lecturers have hitherto had to provide orally, and both students and lecturers will owe the author much thanks for the relief thus given. But the book contains an abundance of references to the literature of all countries, often so allusive as to require a width of reading far beyond that of most students; and yet the discussions of many important topics are too brief (and the statements

sometimes too dogmatic) to give satisfaction to more advanced scholars. While in many places (as *e.g.* on pp. 181 ff.) the matter is presented in that semitabular form which the lecture-room audience loves, there are also passages of almost florid writing, the remembrance of which may lure weak examination candidates to destruction, but which will not always impress more mature readers. But whatever readers the author may have in view, there is a great deal of very serviceable matter in his book; and if he is sometimes rather provocative and drives us to ask whether these things are so, we may be all the better for that.

The arrangement of the matter is not very convenient. Chapter I begins with Epicharmus (whose work is briefly described); then discusses the origins of Attic Comedy; then tells of Susarion, Chionides, Magnes and Ecphantides; then of some of the lost poets of the Old Comedy, but with only a brief reference to the most famous, and with an unexplained disproportion between the several accounts. (Hermippus, for instance, gets but slight notice as compared with some others of no greater importance.) Next follow about twenty pages on the Middle Comedy, and a dozen on the New; and a section on Mimes, *φλύακες*, etc. In Chapter II we begin over again with a full-dress presentation of Epicharmus, and the succeeding chapters give detailed accounts of Cratinus, the School of Crates (in which Plato is rather inappropriately included), Eupolis, Aristophanes and Menander. It would probably have been better to keep the Old Comedy all together, and to treat the Middle Comedy and the New Comedy each as a whole in their proper chronological places. Chapter I seems to be a dumping ground for poets with whom the author does not want to be bothered afterwards; and in so far as it gives a consecutive picture of the development of Comedy, it does so without taking the principal poets into account. Both the Middle and the New Comedy (apart from Menander) are inadequately treated. Much study has been devoted to them in the last quarter of a century, and even if the writings of Wagner,

Breitenbach and others are rather arid, a good deal can be learned from them that is worth presenting even to readers who are not specialists. The author is, I think, unduly contemptuous of the Middle Comedy, the manner of which is said to be (p. 41) 'an urbane reflective manipulation, disillusioned and jaded, superficial but dextrous, suggesting a vast club every member of which is a button-holer.' So far as there is any truth in this it is largely the fault of Stobaeus; but there is a great deal *e.g.* in the fragments of Alexis and Timocles which is far above this level; and if 'the most obvious feature' of the Middle Comedy 'is an almost complete lack of the qualities usually implied by the word "poetry"' (p. 53), it is to be noted that much the same thing is said (p. 352) of Menander, and in neither case, perhaps, is the criticism quite true.

The end of the Middle Comedy is placed rather early (338 B.C.); this would exclude *e.g.* Dionysius, whom Professor Norwood nevertheless assigns to the Middle Period. The theory that there were two poets named Antiphanes might well have been mentioned on p. 40 as solving some difficulties; and it is probably untrue (p. 46) that the mention of philosophers in the Middle Comedy is nearly always casual. Aristophan (of whom the author says nothing) at least seems to have devoted whole plays to them (*Πλάτων*, *Πυθαγοριστής*); and Alexis and Cratinus Junior each wrote a *Πυθαγορίζουσα* and a *Ταραντῖνοι* (also about the Pythagoreans). Professor Norwood has done well to print in full (p. 56) the long fragment, probably of this period and possibly of Alexis, which is not yet in any published collection.

The account of the origins of Attic Comedy in the early part of Chapter I states correctly enough many of the elements in the problem, but makes no reference to the light thrown upon it by the Spartan *δεικηλισταί* or the masks found in the precinct of Artemis Orthia. The note on p. 6, in which the author excuses himself from taking any account of the *ἀγών* or the epirrhematic syzygy, is unfortunate. Despite the absurdities of which Zieliński is sometimes guilty, it is misleading to say that the 'long



discussion of the epirrhematic syzygy comes simply to this, that whereas in Tragedy the correspondent strophes of any lyric are collected in a consecutive mass, in Comedy they are separated by parts of a scene. But this is not only perfectly obvious; it leads nowhere. This statement neglects the essential point—that these structures are so regularly symmetrical (or almost so) as to suggest that such symmetry belonged to the original form of the performances from which Comedy sprang; and the remarks about the *ἀγών* ignore the fact that the *ἀγών* referred to is not merely 'a set elaborate conflict between two leading characters,' but a conflict of a characteristic and recurrent pattern.

The chapters on Epicharmus and on the more important lost poets of the Old Comedy are, apart from a few trifling points, very satisfactory. The first of them contains incidentally good suggestions about the *Busiris* (p. 99, n. 3) and the *Λόγος καὶ Λογίνα* (p. 106, n. 2); but is there really any evidence that the form of Epicharmus' plays was influenced by Aeschylus? It may be doubted whether there is any reference to 'tiling' in Cratinus, fr. 71 (*ἐπειδὴ τοῦστρακὸν παροίχεται*), and whether in Aristoph. *Eq.* 539 *κράμβότατον στόμα* is an excellent rendering of 'what we call "the classical manner" in literature' (p. 147): *κράμβος* probably means here whatever it meant as an epithet of *γέλως*, but what that was is uncertain. The difficulty (p. 148, n. 2) in regard to Crates fr. 15 is avoided if we read (with Bergk) *ἀπὸ τῆς θαλάττης, ἐπὶ* being a dittography from the previous line. The idea that the old woman in Phrynichus (p. 154) was slowly devoured by the monster while still dancing the cordax is fantastic, unless she was devoured head-first. On p. 158 a reference to Herodas' first Mime would have been in place. On p. 162 a reference (e.g. to Geissler's *Chronologie*, p. 41) would have helped readers who wanted to know why the authorship of Phrynichus' (?) *Persae* was disputed. On p. 175 Plato is said to have burlesqued the *Δεῖπνον* of Philoxenus of Cythera, whereas the *Δεῖπνον* was probably the work of Philoxenus of Leucas.

In the long chapter on Aristophanes

it is natural that there should be a good deal upon which opinions may differ. I think that the seriousness of the *Acharnians* (and perhaps of other plays) is overrated, that the laudation of the *Thesmophoriazusae* is exaggerated, and that a good deal of the disquisition on the *Clouds* is rather superficial or even mistaken. The *Clouds* is praised for recognising that 'right education is right, not because it produces wealth or social advancement or good character or good citizenship, but because it deepens and enriches the individual soul'—as if the individual soul were not enriched by good character or good citizenship—qualities which Aristophanes in this play certainly does not despise; and to say of Pheidippides' cry, *ὡς ἡδὺ καινοῖς πράγμασιν καὶ δεξιοῖς ὀμιλεῖν | καὶ τῶν καθεστώτων νόμων ὑπερφρονεῖν δύνασθαι*, that 'it is unmistakable, this cry of the converted soul, this ecstasy as of a youth who suddenly realises Beethoven or Botticelli in the marrow of his soul,' is surely to misinterpret Aristophanes' conception altogether. The summary (pp. 298 ff.) of the general characteristics of Aristophanes, while containing much that is true and interesting, will also give many readers some mild shocks. 'He is not a great humorist.' (The fine distinctions drawn between humour, wit and fun do not wholly justify this.) 'The truth is that he has created no character at all.' 'Nor is he a great playwright.' (This is surely untrue e.g. of the *Frogs*, as of the *Thesmophoriazusae*, the construction of which Professor Norwood especially praises.) On p. 203 the Rural Dionysia should not be spoken of as a Vintage Festival (see Farnell, *Cults V*, pp. 204 ff.). The chapter contains some few delightful translations, and the comparison of the Old Men in the *Wasps* to Justice Shallow is a very happy one.

The chapter on Menander gives a full account of the remains, with a new reconstruction (p. 334) of part of the *Samia*, and much interesting criticism, though in a comparison of Menander's Glycera with the heroines of Shakespeare (pp. 341-2) there are some surprising remarks about some of the latter.

The final chapter on Metre and

Rhythm will be convincing to those who were able to agree with the corresponding chapter in the author's *Greek Tragedy*. Others will regret that he has nothing better to say of Walter Headlam and his followers than the contemptuous sentences of the Preface.

I conclude by noting the very few places in which the author's rendering of Greek words seems to invite a remark. On pp. 3 and 84 πολλά προσφιλοτεχνήσας, 'by many feats of technique,' ignores the preposition, which must signify 'with many artistic additions (or improvements)'; in Athenion fr. i, l. 25, the word evidently = ἐπὶ πλέον αὖξεν τὴν τέχνην. Epicharmus did not merely 'collect the scattered elements,' but added much of his own. There are places where the desire to work in some modern point has led to a distortion of the original idea, e.g. p. 115, Δωροῖ συκοπέδιλε, 'Rule Britanny'; p. 53, ὕπνος τὰ μικρὰ τοῦ θανάτου μυστήρια, 'sleep is the first communion of death'

—here there is no real analogy; p. 126, κεφαληγέρεταν, 'high-brow Jove'; p. 159, περισστέριον ὅμοιον Κλεισθέει, 'Ring-dove Falstaffian.' It seems untrue (as well as irreverent) to say that in the phrase τῆς αἰδοῦς μέλλεις τᾶγαλμ' ἀναπλάττειν Aristophanes has given the Attic equivalent of 'Your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost' (p. 220); but on p. 261 (as in what was said about κραμβότατον στόμα) we have a more tantalising glimpse of the Professor's composition-class at Toronto, when he tells us that 'the words γομποπαγὴ πινακῆδον ἀποσπῶν γηγενεῖ φύσῃματι would be invaluable to anyone who sought the best Greek for "blowing up a battleship."' In Menander fr. 483 (p. 320) ἡμεῖς δ' ἐσμὲν ἐπιγεγραμμένοι, which Professor Norwood renders 'we are sealed as hers,' perhaps means 'we merely endorse' or 'witness' what has been decreed.

A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE.

University of Sheffield.

#### ARISTOTLE'S PSYCHOLOGY OF CONDUCT.

*Aristotle's Psychology of Conduct.* By A. K. GRIFFIN, M.A., Ph.D. Pp. 186. London: Williams and Norgate, 1931. Cloth, 10s. 6d.

DR. GRIFFIN thinks it 'one of Aristotle's glories that he has cut ethics and politics loose from metaphysics and founded them solidly on psychology.' He professes to fill a gap left by the *De Anima* and *Parva Naturalia* by ordering with the minimum of explanatory framework the psychological passages scattered through Aristotle's practical treatises. Hence his book chiefly consists of a description of the emotions (πάθη), preceded by a chapter on the desiderative part of the soul, and a description of the habits of character, preceded by a chapter on the formation of character. Such a compilation, on Dr. Griffin's view, offers the quickest and most fruitful understanding of Aristotle's ethical and social works to the student.

Now the psychology on which Aristotle's ethic is 'solidly founded' is the psychology of *De Anima*, and even if he does express the view that neither

moral conduct nor the theory of it requires philosophic insight, yet his moral theory is bound up with his metaphysical doctrines of fourfold causation, of matter and form, of δύναμις and ἐνέργεια. Some account of these is the irreducible minimum of explanatory framework which the student requires, and Dr. Griffin does not supply it. His only attempt to treat his subject in terms of development is this. He starts (p. 22) from *EN* 1105b 20, where Aristotle distinguishes within man's orectic soul πάθη, δυνάμεις, and ἔξεις. But he confuses their relation. He regards the δύναμις as an innate tendency to such and such a desire, the πάθος as 'the desire in action with its affective side fully developed.' But Aristotle's doctrine is that πάθη—certain ranges of pleasure-pain feelings which lie on a scale between contrary termini—are the primary basis (ὑλη) of conduct, while the δυνάμεις are innate susceptibilities to these πάθη; i.e., strictly speaking, the πάθος is the first stage, the δύναμις the second, and there is 'desire in action' only when the

δύναμις is actualised by the agent reacting to his πάθος. Moreover, these δυνάμεις are, in man, δυνάμεις ἐναντίων or μετὰ λόγου, i.e. potentialities capable of alternative actualisation in either a good or a bad direction, repetition of which forms either a good or a bad ἔξις. But Dr. Griffin quite fails to make either this or the doctrine of the 'mean' clear in his chapter on the formation of character, which he treats as the mere response to environment of a soul in which affection, shame, and the desire to imitate are inborn. No wonder Dr. Griffin thinks (p. 40) that Aristotle does not really consider the problem of free will.

This desire to reduce framework to a

minimum leads Dr. Griffin to treat pleasure (pp. 34 ff.) without discussing the distinction between ἐνέργεια and process (κίνησις and γένεσις). Indeed, he proceeds, on p. 39, to obliterate it by mistranslating *Met.* Θ 1047a 32, which in fact means 'activity and movement (κίνησις) are very commonly thought to be identical,' and does not express Aristotle's own view.

In short, Dr. Griffin flattens the structure of Aristotle's moral theory into little more than a descriptive catalogue, and useful as his parallel citations and cross-references may prove, the student will not get from this book any general preliminary grasp of the subject.

G. R. G. MURE.

Oxford.

## TWO BOOKS ON THE POETICS.

*La Poetica di Aristotele e il Concetto dell'Arte presso gli Antichi.* By ERNESTO BIGNAMI. Pp. xi + 286. Florence: Le Monnier, 1932. Paper, L.24.

*Aristotle on the Art of Poetry. An Analytic Commentary and Notes.* By A. S. OWEN. Pp. 82. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1931. Paper, 2s. 6d.

ON seeing 'The Poetics of Aristotle' in large print on the title-page, and in much smaller 'And the Concept of Art among the Ancients,' one is led to think that Signor Bignami's main theme is to be the Poetics, and, that being so, to expect some comment on catharsis, on the definition, the tragic hero, the theory of diction, etc.—the various cruxes of the Poetics. But though, from the vast bibliography appended, the Signore must have heard of all of these, the only one he sees fit to mention, and that without the slightest discussion of its difficulties, is catharsis. His interest is really in the other half of his subject, 'The Concept of Art,' and not always 'among the Ancients' either. For it is through a veil of Croce, and Croce's views on Aesthetics, that he sees distantly Aristotle. Bignami's aim is 'to show the real bearing of the principal theorems of the Poetics,' which, oddly enough, he takes to be (1) the Beautiful (admitting that Aristotle nowhere defines it,

and only refers to it incidentally twice); (2) Pleasure (here he gives a very clear exposition of the Platonic and the Aristotelian view, though the latter is derived almost entirely from the Ethics and from Politics VIII); (3) the Autonomy of Art (Bignami's best chapter, where Aristotle's insistence on life and all life—with no exceptions on moral grounds—as the artist's subject is emphasised); (4) Mimesis (a long and involved disquisition this, in which the Art of Music, mentioned only incidentally in the Poetics, figures principally. The value of the conclusions in this chapter is gravely lessened by the method of collecting the evidence: e.g. p. 130, where Bignami, on no authority, extends Aristotle's mimesis of action to include mimesis of fancy—an extension in direct opposition to the whole tenour of Aristotelian thought); (7) The Poetic Universal (which Bignami identifies, by some confusion of thought, with the law of Probability or Necessity. Surely the one is the object of art, the other the method of approach to it?).

In his general treatment, while great learning is shown, and much cleverness in presenting points under a new light, there are two defects difficult to overlook: (1) The tendency throughout to seize on such evidence as agrees with his conclusion, and ignore the rest;

e.g. on metre, admit c. 1 of the *Poetics* and neglect the many and inconsistent statements from c. 4 onwards, or again assume, as if no contrary evidence existed, the one interpretation of the twofold origin of Art; and (2) the constant use of the modern aesthetic jargon, meaningless enough in its own setting and wholly out of place in dealing with an ancient author. But for those who are interested in 'The Concept of Art' *per se*, and who like the Roman systematising of what is free and elastic, Bignami has collected here, accessibly and freshly, much of the material to be gleaned from Plato and Aristotle.

Mr. Owen's Companion to the *Poetics* is more modest, and—to the person interested in the *Poetics*—of greater

use. It is intended for the Greekless, and gives help with brevity and accuracy at the points needed. There is only one criticism to offer—is the Companion not perhaps too pedestrian? Of all ancient treatises, the *Poetics* is the most alive. Might not some hint be given of the acuteness and originality of Aristotle's views, and of their bearing on modern and other drama? The Greekless especially need such teaching. Apart from the illustrations, the argument might be discussed, so that the pupil could test its validity on the literature he knew. But, for the passman, this book will no doubt solve any of the puzzles he finds in the *Poetics*.  
C. KEITH.

St. Hilda's College, Oxford.

### ARCHONS OF ATHENS.

*The Archons of Athens in the Hellenistic Age.* By WILLIAM BELL DINSMOOR. Pp. xviii+567 (quarto). Four illustrations. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1931.

THERE has been nothing on the Athenian archons like this great book since in 1898 Professor Ferguson, to whom it is dedicated, discovered his famous law of tribal rotation. It not only gathers up and reviews all the work of three decades, but treats afresh the entire subject of Hellenistic chronology in its various branches; the labour must have been enormous, the learning and ingenuity exhibited are very great, and the book is so full of fresh restorations and new analyses and conclusions that to review it properly would require an essay. Professor Dinsmoor's actual discovery, which suggested the book, was of the missing half of I.G. II<sup>2</sup> 649, which shows that there is a gap in the last section of Diodorus' archon-list and that Olympiodoros had two years of office, 294/3 and 293/2; but this is the least part of the matter. He reconstructs the entire Athenian archon-list from Olympiodoros to 88/7 B.C., and incidentally the Delphic archon-list to 248/7, with a chapter on the priests of Asklepios; Meton's calendar is minutely examined cycle by cycle, with tables of seventeen cycles

(to 109 B.C.) and discussions of the calendars of Kallippos and Hipparchos, both of which he believes (contrary to the usual view) were actually used (he connects Hipparchos' cycle with the triple-dated Athenian inscriptions); many appendices follow, including a new list of the Attic demes and their allocations among the tribes, a revision of the dating of the Delian archon-list, and a revised scheme of chronology for the third century Ptolemies; there is a full bibliography and four indexes. Various accepted dates fall by the wayside; while if his scheme for the Ptolemies be correct—Philopator *accessit* 13 September 222 as joint-king for some months with his father—the terrible Sellasia problem no longer exists. The analysis of the Metonic cycles brings out that there was no fixed system of intercalation, such as Beloch built on in constructing his archon-list; the place of the seven intercalary years in each nineteen-year cycle depended solely on the Government.

Dinsmoor's Athenian list itself is the glorification of Ferguson's law, which he believes continued to function down to 88/7. After Olympiodoros, he admits only two breaks in the rotation in the third century—before Diomedon, epigraphically attested (247), and the creation of Ptolemais (228)—and only



two in the second, in 153 and 145; no one else has achieved so few. His one defect, I think, is that he *occasionally* makes history subserve the 'law' and *occasionally* overlooks historical evidence. He rightly starts from Diokles in 288/7 as a fixed point, the date for which Beloch, Johnson, and myself have always argued, and consequently begins his cycles with Aristonymos in 291/0, as I did in 1913; historically this is inevitable. With his new rotation down to 270 and its consequences I have much sympathy, but I gravely question his dating of the Chremonidean war in 270/69-263/2; doubtless it will be much discussed. I also doubt his archon arrangement for the middle of the third century, for the reorganisation of the Soteria in 249/8 (Polyeuktos) and a subscription to defend Attica in spring 246 (Diomedon) are historically meaningless; Flacelière's 255/4 for Polyeuktos, entailing 253/2 for Diomedon, ought to be right, because this connects the remodelled Soteria with the peace of 255 (end of the second Syrian war), while an Athenian subscription in 252 fits the war with Alexander of Corinth. How great the difficulties are here can be judged from Beloch's final conclusion that for a time rotation must have been abandoned. Dinsmoor's chief trouble is that he has overlooked the peaces of 261 and 255, certain (as Beloch also finally saw) from Delian evidence; I think 255 was a key date, chronologically, for the third century,

just as 145 was (Dinsmoor shews this brilliantly) for the second. And the one really weak page in the book (p. 100) is that in which he struggles to get Kallimedes into the reign of Demetrios II, without which his scheme here goes to pieces; his suggested possible revision of Flacelière's list on p. 111 seems much more probable.—His Delphic list down to Peithagoras is practically Flacelière's, but his Emmenidas in 256/5 gives insufficient room for Aristodemos' tyranny and the catastrophe to the Arcadian League, a point not considered; Flacelière's 259/8 seems the latest year one can admit.—Lastly, I think the attempt to shift one year forward the Delian archons from Lysixenos to Anektos (301-225) miscarries; the reasons are insufficient, and he omits the one conclusive synchronism: an analysis of Eusebius shews that Gonatas restored Athens' freedom in the Julian (= Delian) year 255, and therefore the peace of 255 cannot be shifted to 254.

I have briefly indicated a few historical difficulties; but they must not obscure the fact that the book is a magnificent piece of work and a great advance on anything previously done. It comes at a good time; for if the excavation of the Agora at Athens fulfils expectations, this book will immeasurably lighten the task of interpreting the hoped-for new documents. How much of the labour of the last thirty years will they render useless?

W. W. TARN.

#### MUSA FERIATA.

*Musa Feriata.* By FRANCIS PEMBER. Pp. iv+112. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1931. Cloth, 7s. 6d.

IN this volume the Warden of All Souls' offers seventy-five versions in Latin and Greek of a very charming selection of English, and a little foreign, verse, ranging from Shakespeare in time to living poets and in elevation to Lear's *Nonsense*. His modest Preface tells that almost all were composed in spare moments away from libraries: which considered, the results evince a scholarly mind thoroughly steeped in classical poetry. Dr. Pember's vocabu-

lary is extensive; he has a good perception of the form in which an ancient, especially a Roman, writer would be likely to recast the thought of the English; and he resolutely does his best to leave no part of his original unrepresented. This requires courageous sallies into the No Man's Land which lies between ascertained idiom and indisputable solecism; but these sallies make the versions more interesting, and they are often delightfully successful. Indeed, much of the Latin work seems to me to be as good as a modern scholar can hope to make it.

The same qualities are present in the Greek versions; but here the grasp of the language is less sure and the number of really satisfying pieces smaller. I feel bound to add that the Greek has not been adequately revised.

In a new edition the following points will need attention:

*insuper* c. acc. (9. 3) seems to be eschewed by poets: *quum* (23. 10) is written *cum* in the line before. Illicit hiatus at end of anapaestic dimeter (54. 1). A self-contained single-word tribrach in fifth place of iambic trimeter (24. 1, 38. 14 and 17) not found in Tragedy,<sup>1</sup> nor, *me teste*, in Menander, who is perhaps the model for 38.

*μνήσας* is used thrice as an *imperative* in 48 (oddly enough the ending *-σαι* was ignored in Monro, *H.G.* § 5). *οὐ* with a participle which, if I understand the English, is hortative in effect, (30. 2), should be *μή. ἐκκρίτας* (24. 16) should be *-ους*. *οὐδὲ* (bis) seems hard to justify in 48. 8: why not *οὔτε*? *ἠὺλῆσατο* (74. 2) seems to be an unknown middle, *ὄβριμος* (18. 17) unexampled in iambs, and *αἰζῶς* purely tragic. I have serious doubts whether the form of the condition *εἰ μόλε* in 68. 8 is defensible. Hardly enough support can be found for *Δώριος* of persons (22. 12), *κρέκειν* (22. 14) of wind-instruments (*Anth.* Plan. 239 is not good stuff), *σφυδῶν κῆρ* (8. 11) = 'great heart,' *φοιτᾷ* (64. 1) = 'is fugacious,' *ἄσει* as fut. active (22. 1).

Hyperdorisms are *ὀδάγασεν* (4. 18), *θρύλασεν* (12. 3), *εἰλαχῶς* (12. 8), *αὐλάσας*, oddly followed by *ἤγαγεν* (22. 10), *ἀπόρρητον* (22. 5), *ταλεπλάνους* (30. 1),

*ἄλιθα* (22. 20)—cf. Callim. *H.* 5. 124—and probably *ἀμύνουσα* (30. 2), unless Hesiod's *ἄμυνεν* (intrans.) in *Frag.* 96. 86 is a congener.

In No. 10 the infinitives *ἀγαπάσμεν* (*sic*) and *ἀπολανέμεναι* are questionable. The elegists included in Bergk's *Anth. Lyr.* (Part I.) have very few (13–15) infinitives formed with *μ*: I believe the following statement is complete: (a) in *-μεναι*, *τεθνάμεναι* Tyrtæus, Theognis, Mimnermus; *ἔμμεναι* Solon; *ἔμμεναι* Euenus; *θέμεναι*, *ἰδμεναι* Theognis; all non-thematic: (b) in *-μεν*, *εἰμεν*, *δόμεν*, *ἐνθέμεν* (+ *ἔμεν ex coni.* 806), *ἐχέμεν*, *αἰδίδεμεν*, *πασχέμεν* (+ *μελέμεν ex coni.* 1058); only 3 or 4 thematic cases, all in Theognidea. There are no cases of either form with *μ* in Callim. *H.* 5 and *Epigg.*, nor in Theocr. *Epigg.* And *-μεναι* is denied to Doric by Kühner-Blass (210. 9).

The Lesbian of 14 and 16 needs review with the aid of recent studies, as those of Mr. Lobel; and the form *γελεύσα* (4. 8 and 12. 1) is unknown to me.

Better accents are needed for *ἐπι-στροφῶ* (4. 5), *κείπερ*, *εἶσ'* (6. 1), *θελκτρά* (6. 12), *εὐηθῆς* (8. 2), *χρῆ* (? misprint for *χρῆν*) (8. 4), *πλῆν* (8. 7), *προσείκασαι* (8. 15), *δυναῖς* (24. 5), *σβεσεῖ* (24. 9), *πετραῖς* (24. 10), *ᾧσει* (38. 18), *ἀρούρα* (48. 11), *πελάγος* (64. 16) and, I think, *ἀλλά σε* (30. 4), the pronoun needing stress.

Misprints are *δειματωμένης* (24. 3), *ἔλοντο* (30. 6), *πέφυκε*—surely for *᾿πεφύκει*—(38. 18), and dropped iotas in 6. 12, 12. 1, 18. 6, 22. 12, 26. 2, 34. 1.

GILBERT A. DAVIES.

University of Glasgow.

## GREEK STUDIES.

*A Companion to Greek Studies.* Fourth edition, revised; edited by LEONARD WHIBLEY. Pp. xxxviii+790; with 5 maps and 200 illustrations. Cambridge: University Press, 1931. 25s. net.

FOR nearly thirty years the *Companion to Greek Studies* has been almost indispensable to any serious student of Greek literature and archaeology. It is fifteen

years since it was last revised, and this fresh edition should receive a warm welcome. Though much new matter has been added, it has been so arranged by judicious compression and omission that the fourth edition is only three pages longer than its predecessor, and it is a convenience that much of the pagination should remain the same. Sometimes it may be regretted that this

<sup>1</sup> I owe this and other information about tribrachs to Mr. Ernest Harrison.

ingenuity has made it difficult to add as much as might be desired; for instance, though so much new light has been thrown on Menander during this century, he is still only given ten lines in the account of the Greek drama, which also almost completely ignores the tragedies of the fourth century and does not contain the least reference to Agathon.

Much new work has been introduced into many of the sections, and entirely new articles have replaced those in the third edition on Gems, Money, Music, and Metre. Instead of the articles written on the first and second of these subjects by Professor Ridgeway we have contributions by Mr. H. B. Walters on Gems and by Mr. E. G. S. Robinson on Money; Mr. R. P. Winnington-Ingram has written an account of Greek Music, which has replaced that of Mr. R. D. Archer-Hind; and Mr. C. M. Bowra's article on Metre takes the place of that written by Dr. Verrall. As an indication of the contrast between these two accounts of Metre it may be noticed that in Dr. Verrall's bibliography the first name is that of J. H. H. Schmidt, which does not appear at all in that of Mr. Bowra. Certain erroneous statements on pages 737 and 738 with regard to lines containing the hephthemimeral caesura and to the trochaic tetrameter have already been corrected and the sheet has been reprinted.

The differences in the illustrations are considerable; the new articles on Gems and Money naturally have needed fresh illustrations; and, apart from that, the illustrations, especially those of Sculpture, are often from better blocks, and sometimes the same statue or building as was depicted before is

represented more effectively from a different angle.

An adequate review of a book of such wide range would require almost as many critics as the authors engaged in its production. But it is obvious to any careful reader how much Mr. Whibley is to be congratulated on the way in which the revision has been carried out. A few questionable statements and a few misprints survive from the earlier editions. It is by no means universally held now that the *τραγικὸς χορὸς* (p. 135) meant a 'chorus of satyrs,' or that Aeschylus in fr. 207 used *τράγος* in the sense of 'satyr.' The chief evidence that Choerilus developed the satyr-chorus (p. 136) is derived from the often-quoted line

*ἦνίκα μὲν βασιλεὺς ἦν Χοερίλος ἐν σατύροις,*

but it is not certain that Choerilus the tragedian is being spoken of here, or that the line has a literary, and not a moral reference. Was Plato Comicus (p. 145) mainly a political satirist? He lived on into the time of Middle Comedy, and in his later life dealt with subjects very different from the Hyperbolus and Cleophon of his earlier period. Laius was not travelling from Delphi to Thebes (p. 699) but *vice versa* when he met Oedipus. Of misprints I have noticed an apparently otiose 'been' (p. 140, l. 16), *καμῶς* (p. 433), and *αὐταρκεία* (p. 434). It is a pity also that not all the writers adopt the excellent example of some in giving the dates of the works enumerated in their bibliographies. But these are small defects in a work which, valuable in its first edition, has now been enormously improved in its fourth.

A. S. OWEN.

*Keble College, Oxford.*

#### IN HONOUR OF REITZENSTEIN.

*Festschrift Richard Reitzenstein zum 2. April 1931 dargebracht.* Pp. 168. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1931. RM. 8.

THIS collection of essays was planned as a greeting to Reitzenstein on the occasion of his seventieth birthday; but he died on March 23, 1931, just too

early to receive the gift. To quote from the prefatory elegiacs:

*serta tulit festiva cohors; qui nunc locus illis?  
sint saltem tumulto munera grata tuo.*

Reitzenstein's scholarship was notable for the wide range of subjects that it covered, as may be seen from the valuable bibliography of his writings com-

piled by R. Reitzenstein jun. and appended to this volume. It is only fitting that the essays themselves should cover a wide field. H. Fränkel (*Drei Interpretationen aus Hesiod*) emphasises the position of Hesiod as midway between primitive myth and philosophic exposition. M. Pohlenz (*Cicero de re publica als Kunstwerk*) contributes a sympathetic study of the work in question, in the course of which he claims that Cicero understood Plato's technique better than did Platonic critics of the nineteenth century. J. Stroux (*Augustinus und Ciceros Hortensius*) illustrates from Secundinus' polemic against Augustine the personal fervour which distinguished the *Hortensius* from Cicero's other philosophic writings. E. Fraenkel (*Das Reifen der horazischen Satire*) shows how Horace in the *Satires* advanced from traditional invective to the expression of an original philosophy of life. E. Schwartz (*Die sog. Sammlung der Kirche von Thessalonich*) corrects the errors and omissions of Holste, who first published the collection, and whose text has not been questioned by subsequent commentators. All these essays are well worth reading, but for the classical scholar the most interesting article is that of E. Reitzenstein, entitled *Zur Stiltheorie des Kallimachos*. In Sect. 1 the writer examines the history of the word *λεπτός* and its application by the Alexandrians to literary style, arguing that the title of Aratus' collection (*τὰ κατὰ λεπτόν*) means poems composed in the *λεπτός* (fine, subtle) style. In

Sect. 2 he discusses the attitude of the Alexandrians and their Roman imitators to Hesiod. Homer being in a class by himself (he is the *ἀοιδῶν ἑσχατος*, 'supreme,' of Call. *Ep.* 27), the Alexandrians legitimised themselves by claiming descent from Hesiod. In Sect. 3 Reitzenstein investigates the symbolism employed by the Alexandrians and Romans to describe the poet's dedication to his craft (*die Dichterweihe*). Whereas Hesiod had attributed his inspiration to the gift by the Muses of a staff, Callimachus represented both Hesiod and himself as drinking from Hippocrene. Hence the polemic in the epigrams of Antipater against the Callimachean school as 'water-drinkers' (*ὕδροπόται*). The distinction between the sources of Epic and Elegiac inspiration found in Latin poetry (Verg. *E.* 6. 64 ff.; Prop. 2. 10. 25 ff.; Prop. 3. 3) is an innovation of the Romans, due to the changed circumstances. Ennius borrowed the Dream motive from the Alexandrians, but his use of it is quite different. The whole article deserves to be carefully studied by those interested in Alexandrian Poetry and Propertius. One passage (A.P. 11. 31) cited from Antipater, where he abhors the *ὕδροπόται* as *μύθων μνήμονες*,<sup>1</sup> suggests a clue to the difficult *memorem* . . . *Philitan* of Prop. 2. 34. 31.

E. A. BARBER.

Exeter College, Oxford.

<sup>1</sup> The phrase has apparently a double meaning = (1) 'who remember what is said,' cf. *μῦθον μνήμονα συμπότην*; (2) 'who remember legends.'

#### A HISTORY OF AUTOBIOGRAPHY.

*Geschichte der Autobiographie.* By G. MISCH. Erster Band: Das Altertum. 2nd edition. Pp. xiii + 472. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1931. Cloth 2M. 16 (unbound, 14).

THIS book takes within its purview, not only the formal autobiographies of the ancients, but all their writings of a consciously self-revealing type. It studies these, not in regard to their stylistic technique, but on account of their content and object. Its central topic is the growth of the faculty of detached self-observation.

The author passes summarily over the copious autobiographic literature of the ancient East, most of which he dismisses as naïve self-glorification in conventional forms. Autobiography in a serious sense he regards as a Greek invention. Archilochus and Solon (not to speak of Sappho) were the real prototypes of the self-conscious individual; Socrates introduced scientific self-analysis; Aristotle recognised the element of growth in character.

The results of Greek self-study he illustrates by the considerable mass



of surviving autobiographical works of the Roman age. He comments somewhat severely upon the tendentious memoirs of the late Republican age (in which we may perhaps see the *damnosa hereditas* of works like the *Hypomnemata* of Aratus) and the small-beer diaries of the early Caesars and their wives (whose trivial tone may have been suggested by the anecdotic Hellenistic biographies of Satyrus and Hermippus). On the other hand he gives due praise to the honest self-revelations of Cicero (in the *Brutus* and the *Letters*), and skilfully brings into relief the calm dignity of Augustus' *Res Gestae* (in welcome contrast to Dessau's recent strictures on that great work).

But the author's main interest lies in the autobiographies of the second and later centuries A.D., to which he devotes

one-half of this volume. Here he hardly seems to give due weight to the element of world-flight in some of the self-absorbed introverts of this later age. But perhaps the best chapters of the book are those in which he traces the influence of Stoicism, with its peculiar blend of self-respect and willing resignation, upon the writings of Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius, and the powerful influence, in form and content, of later pagan autobiography upon the Confessions of the early Church Fathers.

Professor Misch's work, which is written in a somewhat technical philosophical parlance, does not make easy reading. But it may be commended as a thoroughly original piece of work, and the product of much searching reflection.

M. CARY.

*University of London.*

#### A NEW VIEW OF SULLA.

*Sylla, ou la Monarchie manquée.* By J. CARCOPINO. Pp. 245; 1 table. Paris: 'L'Artisan du Livre,' 1931. Paper, 20 frs.

THE object of this remarkable book is to prove, contrary to accepted opinions, that Sulla was not a loyal aristocrat but the first Roman tyrant. The author states his case with all his usual forcefulness and felicity of style. His main arguments may be summed up thus:

1. Ancient tradition, from Cicero and Sallust onward, represents Sulla as a mere usurper.

2. Though of ancient lineage, Sulla did not belong to the governing inner circle. (He formed part of the *noblesse déchue*, from which also sprang Catiline and Caesar.)

3. His nomination to the dictatorship came as an unwelcome surprise to the Senate.

4. In his legislation Sulla broke down the barriers, not to the free play of an aristocracy, but to the unfettered action of a monarch. Instead of appointing censors to refill the Senate (as was done after Cannae), he packed it with his own nominees.

5. Sulla's intimacy with Fortune and other protecting deities was designed to provide him with a monarchical halo.

6. In answer to the obvious retort, 'Why then did Sulla abdicate?' Professor Carcopino unmasks the countervailing influence of Metellus Pius and his coterie, in whom he recognises the principal wire-pullers of the later Republic. Metellus, who had obtained promotion for Sulla in 89-8 B.C. and in 83-2 had raised an army to secure his restoration, made a secret but successful stand against Sulla's dictatorship. He suborned Cicero to expose the autocrat's régime in the courts; he organised a block vote for Lepidus; above all, he detached Sulla's own Senate and his right-hand man Pompey from him. In the face of a coalition of senatorial opinion and of the troops of Metellus and Pompey, Sulla gamely owned himself beaten.

Our verdict will no doubt depend on our acceptance of this last argument, and on our reply to the further question, 'Why did Sulla disband his army?' But whether Professor Carcopino's thesis is accepted *in toto* or not, it will assuredly compel us to reconsider current views on Sulla, and to compare no less than to contrast him with Caesar.

M. CARY.

*University of London.*

## MORE LOEB CICERO.

*Cicero: Pro Milone, In Pisonem, Pro Scauro, Pro Fonteio, Pro Rabirio Postumo, Pro Marcello, Pro Ligario, Pro Deiotaro.* With an English translation by N. H. WATTS. Pp. viii + 547. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1931. Cloth, 10s. net; leather, 12s. 6d. net.

EIGHT years ago surprise was expressed that Mr. Watts had based his text on the obsolete edition of R. Klotz, except for one of the speeches in which he had used a still older edition. In this second volume he has used the text of Baier and Kayser (1862), except for the *Font.*, for which he has used that of C. F. W. Müller. So it comes about, among other things, that the fragments of *Pis.* do not include those in the *Cusanus*, which were published more than sixty years ago; in *Scaur.* F. Schöll's revised readings of the *Taurinensis*—for example at 3 and 48—are ignored; Mr. Watts thinks there is a hiatus at *Mil.* 33, and reads at 40 *tenebris* (which is contrary to Ciceronian usage), 47 *ei qui* (which makes nonsense of the passage), 64 *frenorum* before *pilorumque*, 68 *antestaretur*, 74 *arma* (as if Harl. 2682 and its reading *harenam* were still unknown), 85 *religiones*, 86 *Sergii*, 90 *Sex. Clodio duce*, *Pis.* 11 *gremio*, 22 *uino*, 94 *insimulationem*, 95 *poena remansit*, *Scaur.* 37 *totius*, *Font.* 42 *fortissimis* (where Stangl's *lectissimis* is better), *Marc.* 14 *consilio* for *officio*. It is impossible to point out all the weaknesses of the text; one can only make a strong protest, all the more emphatic since a recent prospectus of the Loeb Classical Library says that 'the best critical texts have been provided.'

The reader is not told why conjectures are printed in italics sometimes, but not always. Mr. Watts writes *suspicio* everywhere, I think, except *Mil.* 68. He gives some forty critical notes. He does not explain on what principle they are chosen. Twenty-four give accurate information; those on pp. 120, 164, 170, 280, 284, 288, 292, 300, 370, 390, 402 (n. 1), and 468 say what is false or only part of the truth. There is no bibliography. A prefatory note mentions Long, and expresses obligation in *Mil.*

to Poynton and Colson, but says nothing of Reid and Clark.

Much of the translation reads pleasantly, but there are some awkward passages. It would have been well to avoid words like 'howbeit' and 'chiefest,' and 'sans voice, sans liberty, sans authority' is unnecessary at *Pis.* 99, in the introduction to which speech we hear of a conference 'as to the application of artificial respiration to enable the triumvirate to continue.' There are strange translations: at *Mil.* 99 *non male aliquando de me meriti, sed semper optime*, 'not those whom I have on any occasion harmed, but those whom I have on all occasions helped'; *Pis.* 1 *noviciorum*, 'newly-freed slaves,' 11 *vidente te*, 'beneath our eyes'; and at *Mil.* 27 Mr. Watts upsets the narrative by translating the date as January 20 instead of 18. There are other mistakes at *Mil.* 4, 69, 74, *Pis.* 34, *Marc.* 6, 7, 28, *Deiot.* 14, 18, 24. The punctuation is faulty in the text at *Mil.* 6, *Pis.* 91, *Marc.* 1, in the translation at *Mil.* 72, 89, *Scaur.* 45. Words are left untranslated at *Mil.* 25, 34, 39, 49, 73, 85, 86, 87, 93, 95, 102, *Pis.* 6, 56, 61, 63, 68, 76, 81, 96, *Scaur.* 47, *Font.* 28, 33, 42, *Rab.* 3, 7, 15, 16, 23, 28, *Marc.* 5, 23, 24, *Lig.* 13, *Deiot.* 7, 15, 38, 42. What is more unfortunate is that Mr. Watts translates something different from what he has in his text at *Pis.* 22, 29, 44, 68, 70, 95, 96, *Rab.* 47, *Marc.* 3, *Deiot.* 21, 41.

Mr. Watts is sparing with his notes, which are not consistently well chosen. No one understands Cicero better for being told on p. 40 to 'note how often *Cui bono?*' is used to-day by journalists and others in the impossible sense of 'What is the good?'" Explanation of more of the historical allusions would be more helpful. The unnecessary quotation on p. 86 is in inverted commas, but the original has suffered three alterations. The note at *Pis.* 33 on *unam et perpetuam* might mention Catull. V. 6. The note referred to on p. 303 does not exist.

The notes might be more accurate. P. 200: The senate commissioned Lentulus not in 58, but in 57; nor was he

'then proconsul of Cilicia.' P. 214: II. 4. 17, apparently repeated from Long, should be II. 4. 18. P. 232: Torquatus was consul not in 64, but in 65. P. 264: The discoverers of the two palimpsests are given the wrong way round. P. 284: Cicero prosecuted Verres not in 72, but in 70. P. 390: Rutilius was convicted not in 93, but in 92, as is said on pp. 266 and 344. P. 394: *Medea* 356, apparently repeated from Long, should be *Medea* 352. P. 488: The letter to Atticus should not be XIII. 43, but XIII. 44. P. 497: It was to Deiotarus the younger that Cicero en-

trusted his son and nephew. P. 534: The battle of Magnesia occurred not in 192, but in 190 or 189. On p. 417 Cicero's governorship of Cilicia is oddly dated 50-51. At *Scaur.* 5 *qui* (sc. Pythagoras and Plato) *tamen ipsi mortem ita laudant ut fugere uilam uelent* Mr. Watts strangely gives a reference to *Apology* 28E, where Socrates says that it would have been a terrible thing if, through fear of death, he had abandoned his heaven-sent mission. Cicero has in mind *Phaedo* 61C ff. But enough.

G. B. A. FLETCHER.

*University of Liverpool.*

### ROMAN LITERARY THEORY AND CRITICISM.

#### *Roman Literary Theory and Criticism.*

By the Rev. J. F. D'ALTON, M.A., D.D., D.Litt., Professor of Greek at St. Patrick's College, Maynooth. Pp. x+608. London: Longmans, 1931. Cloth, 21s.

In a modest preface the author disclaims the intention of composing a systematic history of Roman literary theory—that, indeed, has yet to be written; but in a field which has obviously attracted him he has confined himself to such aspects as would serve to illustrate the main tendencies in the work of Roman critics. His eight chapters are entitled 'The Awakening of the Critical Spirit,' 'Aspects of the Problem of Style,' 'Cicero as Critic,' 'Cicero and the Atticists,' 'Ancients versus Moderns,' 'Horace and the Classical Creed,' 'The Supremacy of Rhetoric,' and 'A Retrospect.' The bibliography is instructively full, and there is a useful index. Professor D'Alton owns that he had to omit certain questions of importance, and that he would have liked to deal more fully with the two Senecas, Petronius, and Quintilian as critics. Possibly his adopted scheme is in part responsible for a certain want of parsimony in handling and for the growth of the book beyond the proportions originally contemplated: a closer adherence to chronological treatment might eventually have saved space. The detailed and important account of Horace, for instance, comes rather late

in the book, and has partly to be anticipated in previous sections.

But in general the treatment is well conceived and well worked out. The evolution of Roman criticism from its early leavening by Hellenic and Hellenistic influences is traced with a fulness which is amply supported by references in the footnotes. Professor D'Alton is particularly successful in his presentation of Cicero's contribution to criticism, where he rightly emphasises Cicero's extensive application of his historical method as, despite shortcomings in the use of it, no small achievement for his time. Cicero's enrichment of the critical vocabulary in Latin is naturally also recognised, and his influence is traced in Horace's doctrine of the golden mean, which fits into the Horatian preference for decorum in satire. A very judicious resistance is offered to Mommsen's absurdly biased opinion that Cicero's rhetorical writings are unequal in chasteness of form or precision of thought to the *Rhetoric* dedicated to Herennius! One of the virtues of the book is the fitting way in which the Greek foundations of Roman rhetoric are kept in view. Justice is also done to the coterie spirit as a formative influence on Horace as a critic, while the chapters concerned with style and the recurrent battle between the old and the new in literature contain illuminating references to modern criticism. The section on the supremacy of rhetoric

contains much that is suggestive; and here, though a long chapter on Horace has preceded, the author's scheme brings him back to the *Ars Poetica* as influenced by rhetoric (p. 468 ff.), a part of his work where he considers modern views regarding the famous poem. The final retrospect gives a handy summary of results attained in the survey.

Repetitions occur—some difficult perhaps to avoid, some indeed salutary; but it is unnecessary to remind us within three pages that Theophrastus was Aristotle's pupil (69, 72). There are also needless repetitions, almost verbatim, in the treatment of Horace's attitude to Lucilius: sometimes, however, a slight inconsistency appears, e.g. p. 357, 'probably Lucilius' admirers had attributed to his work something of the urbane and refined humour . . . of the writers of the Old Comedy'; and p. 366, 'Lucilius' ardent admirers . . . evidently (an overworked adverb) had proclaimed that he exhibited in his satires the spirit of the Old Comedy writers.' This is restated on p. 368.

Preference is shown for the old spellings *jam*, *jussit*, *cujusque*, and *quum*—yet not always; for if we meet *quum* *forent* on p. 416, we have *cum* *canerem* on p. 417; *obscenos* p. 403, but *obscena* p. 364; *pro Coelio* p. 472, but *Caelius* p. 253. A few misprints have passed

unnoticed, though hardly an undue number where the documentation is so full: *Peripetetic* (72); *accomodata* (117); *amimorum* (224); *tullianae* (350); *Lucilus* (528); *parodox* (554); *χαπακρήπες* (467). Conington's name is consistently misspelled (290, 305, and in the bibliography). *Himself* is displaced p. 274, l. 10; and the contractions seem strange in 'Eurip's famous line' (89) and 'Luc's faculty' (53). P. 296, n. 5, the text of the epigram quoted by Gellius should run 'postquam est mortem aptus Plautus,' not 'morte datu 'st'; and Pompius epigram (296) on Ennius might be referred for its Latin form either to Buecheler's edition of Varro's *Satirae Menippeae* or to Morel's *Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum*.

Here and there statements lie open to challenge. Alliteration, for example, is older than Italian *carmina* (454, n. 7); and the remark that Seneca employed the novel mode in Latin prose 'as a medium for some vapid moralising' does scant justice to his noble thought. But there is abundance of sound sense shown in the book; it has the great merit of clear expression; and should fulfil the author's hope of assisting those who choose to labour in the same field.

J. WIGHT DUFF.

Armstrong College,  
Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

#### A FRENCH STUDY OF JUVENAL.

*Les Satires de Juvénal. Étude et analyse* par PIERRE DE LABRIOLLE, professeur à la Sorbonne. Paris: Mellottée. Pp. 361.

THIS book does not call for much notice from a learned journal, being meant for readers who wish to hear that there are black swans in Australia and who need to be told that Quirinus was another name for Romulus and that *homo* is not the same as *uir*. M. Labriolle paraphrases Juvenal's satires and provides information, accessible elsewhere, about their subjects and circumstances, but communicates hardly anything that a scholar will thank him for unless it is the identification (which he attributes to W. M. Flinders Petrie, *Nagada and Ballas*, p. 65, 1896) of

Juvenal's *Ombi* (which he calls *Ombos* because Juvenal mentions it in the accusative) with a *Nubt* actually adjacent to Tentyra and not, like the other *Nubt* (*Kom Ombo*), 120 miles away (p. 323). The attribution however should rather have been made to J. Duemichen, *Gesch. d. alten Aegyptens*, pp. 125 f., 1879. The imitations of Juvenal culled from the French poets are welcome for their literary interest.

Mistranslations occur too often. I 26 *uerna Canopi* 'un esclave de Canope,' 60 *dum* (causal) 'qui,' III 281 *ergo* 'mais non,' IV 121 *Cilicis* 'du Cilicien,' 128 *erectas in terga* 'qui se hérissent sur son dos,' V 108 *modicis amicis* 'leurs moindres amis,' VI 262 f. *quanta* (fascia) *poplitibus sedeat* 'comme elles restent



fermes sur leurs jarrets,' 299 *saecula* 'l'œuvre des siècles,' VII 112 *conspuitur sinus* 'ils souillent de bave leur poitrine,' 136 *conuenit illi* 'il lui plaît,' 238 *cera uolunt facit* 'sculpte,' XII 78 *igitur* 'oui' (the equally distressing *igitur* of XVI 18 is simply omitted), XV 90 *autem* 'puisque.' The verses XIV 50-3 are not recognisable in the translation on p. 308.

'Néron' on p. 107 is a misprint, '500' on p. 77 a slip of the pen, and 'incipit o Calliope! licet et consedere' on p. 98 perhaps a mixture of both; but there is no such excuse for 'de

pierres' on p. 71 as a rendering of *latericiam*, nor for the statement on p. 210 that Naeuolus in *sat.* IX is a *cinaedus*.

On p. 330 it is said that 'on a repéré récemment une imitation, jusqu'ici inaperçue,' in *Tert. adu. Marc.* IV 24, and reference is given to 'C. Weyman, dans le *Néo-Philologus*, t. VII (1922).' This allusion by Tertullian to Iuu. III 231 was noted by Mayor in 1886, vol. I, p. 383. The statement on p. 331 that 'le fameux Heiric d'Auxerre composa sur les *Satires* tout un commentaire' is interesting if true.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

#### ROMAN BRITAIN.

*Roman Britain* 1914-1928. (British Academy Supplemental Papers, No. VI.) By SIR GEORGE MACDONALD. Pp. 114. London: Milford, 1931. Paper, 7s. 6d. net.

IN 1930 Sir George Macdonald contributed to the Nineteenth Report of the *Römisch-Germanische Kommission* a valuable survey of the additions made between 1914 and 1928 to our knowledge of the Roman occupation of Britain, and he now lays his own countrymen under an obligation, which they will gratefully acknowledge, by presenting his survey in an English dress, with little change beyond some references to books or articles that have appeared in the interval. The English version, beautifully printed and generously illustrated, is a delight to the eye, and its lucidity and grace of style make it a pleasure to read. Beginning with the work done on the legionary fortresses, the Wall of Hadrian and the Antonine Wall, it proceeds to set forth what has been accomplished elsewhere in Wales, Scotland, and England, and ends with brief notices of the most important inscriptions and of the literature which there has not been occasion to mention in the course of the narrative. Written by a scholar who is the *doyen* of workers in this field and who combines a notable flair for the interpretation of archaeological data with equally notable sanity of judgment, this comprehensive review will be appreciated both by fellow

archaeologists and by students of history who are not specialists in this sphere. The former will find much in the way of criticism and suggestion to aid and stimulate them in further work of research. The latter, whose primary interest lies in the historical results extorted from the archaeological material and in the method by which they are attained, and who, as they peruse detailed reports, may sometimes find the wood less visible than the trees, will heartily welcome a lucid survey which avoids obscuring the main issues by a mass of detail and draws a timely distinction between assured or probable conclusions and theories which are no more than tentative hypotheses, based sometimes on slender evidence and in any case not to be accepted as ascertained facts without further investigation. As examples of clear exposition, cogent reasoning and prudent reserve, may be commended the section which handles the more recent and still unsolved problems of Hadrian's Wall, and that which deals with the forts of the Saxon Shore and discusses the excavations at Richborough, which have not yet provided a decisive answer to the questions when these forts were established (here the evidence from Caerleon is clearer) and when their abandonment finally severed the tie that bound Britain to Rome. But it is needless to pick and choose. Those who wish to keep abreast of the progress of knowledge

about Britain under the Romans will read the whole account and enjoy it, and they will thank the author for the

pleasure and profit they have derived from it.

J. G. C. ANDERSON.

*Brasenose College, Oxford.*

## TWO ETYMOLOGICAL DICTIONARIES OF LATIN.

*Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Latine.* Par A. ERNOUT et A. MEILLET. Pp. xix+1108. Paris: Klincksieck, 1932. Cloth, fr. 250.

IN recent years the comparative study of the Indo-European languages has tended more and more to rely upon the clever manipulation of grammars and dictionaries, the users of which have frequently but little real knowledge of the languages they cite. From these books they extract a mass of undigested material which is then inserted into comparative grammars and etymological dictionaries in such volume that frequently even enthusiastic specialists feel overwhelmed, while to the uninitiated the whole subject with its strange symbols and polyglot vocabulary becomes utterly meaningless and repellent. It is therefore with all the more pleasure that one welcomes the new etymological dictionary of Latin by Ernout and Meillet, which should be a boon to specialist and non-specialist alike, for these names are in themselves ample guarantee of soundness and sanity. Their aim in this work is to give an historical account of the vocabulary of Latin, and they have approached it by two different but complementary methods. In the first place we are given an account of the morphological and semasiological development of each word within Latin itself from the time of the earliest inscriptions down through the literary and later epigraphic texts to the beginning of the Romance period. This, by far the heavier section of the work, has been well performed by Ernout. Meillet, on the other hand, has had charge of what one may call the prehistoric part. It has been his task to trace the development of the Latin vocabulary from the time of the common Indo-European language down to the time when the available evidence clearly marks off Latin as an independent member of the Indo-European group. The two methods and their

results, however, have not been kept sharply severed in the articles on the various words, and wisely so, for the history of a language is a continuous development, and both methods, the comparative and the philological, are alike necessary to the student. Without attempting any detailed criticism of so large a work, one may briefly say that a cursory examination of this dictionary leaves one with a very high idea of its merits. Its purpose is a sound one, it is comprehensive and well arranged, and both authors have performed their several tasks in the way that one expects from such distinguished scholars. The knowledge and skill contributed by Ernout may be seen at once from the articles on such words as *ago, facio*, with their many meanings and numerous compounds. But the most interesting part to the present reviewer is that contributed by Meillet. In a most excellent preface he explains the aims and principles of his work. He is not concerned with propounding new etymologies. His aim is to give only those which are either quite certain or very probable, and to sweep away all the other encrustations of the past fifty years, which are only blocking the way to further progress. Not one single new etymology does he propose, and he expresses the hope that none that is certain or almost so has been omitted. His canons are very strict. For the history of a word it is not enough merely to establish a connexion between roots, for much more is necessary. The connexion of Lat. *pecu* with O.H.G. *fihu* and Skt. *paśu* is certain, for the three words agree in form, gender, and use, and that cannot be mere coincidence. But to connect Lat. *fons* with Skt. *dhanvati* is useless, because Lat. *f* has many different origins, because the agreement does not extend beyond the root, and because the semasiological connexion is vague and general. The easier an etymology is,

the less likely is it to be right. It is not enough to connect Lat. *fero* with φέρω and with Skt. *bharāmi*. One must also show that the root \*bher- was both thematic and non-thematic, that it had both monosyllabic and disyllabic forms, and finally that it indicated a continuous process and so could form neither aorist nor perfect; and so we understand why *fero* in Latin is completed by *tuli* and *latus*. Not only the form but the use also must be explained by a good etymology. Again, some words are common Indo-European, stretching over the whole domain, e.g. *pater*, while others such as *credo*, *rex*, *lex* appear only in Italic and Celtic on the one hand and in Aryan on the other. A good etymology then determines the area within which cognates are found. Again, words belong to different strata of a community. Some are literary, others popular, others technical, and so on, and full account must be taken of each kind. Sometimes even when a Latin word is the exact phonological counterpart of an Indo-European word it may have entirely changed its nature, e.g. *vox*. Finally, very important in dealing with the vocabulary of Latin is the matter of borrowing not only from the other Italic languages, but also from Greek, Celtic, Etruscan, and elsewhere. On all these questions Meillet has sought not so much to give definite information as to propound the problems and point the way to their solution, for much remains to be done. At times he seems over-cautious, but that is not a vice in a subject like this, and when the master hesitates the disciples will do well to beware.

*A Concise Etymological Dictionary of Latin.* By T. G. TUCKER, Litt.D. Pp. xxxi + 307. Halle: Niemeyer, 1931. Paper, Rm. 21 (bound, 23).

PROFESSOR TUCKER explains in his preface the reasons which led him to compose his dictionary. Habitual use of Walde's *Etymologisches Wörterbuch* (second edition—a greatly enlarged and improved third edition is being published by J. B. Hofmann) for many years convinced him that in spite of its great excellences it is not so sound as it

might be, nor is it calculated to arouse the interest in Comparative Philology which the subject deserves. To arrive at a root \*ker- or \*qer- as underlying a group of words is not enough. It should be regarded merely as the clearing of the way towards further research, especially in the direction of probing much deeper into the fundamental meanings and relations of the Indo-European roots and so simplifying their ultimate number. Further, as he points out in the preface, the *New English Dictionary* is very unsatisfactory as regards cognates outside the Teutonic group, and so Professor Tucker, whose studies have been chiefly concerned with Latin, Greek, and English, has made a special feature of the last two languages in this work. The English cognates are treated very fully indeed, and he ranges for his examples through all strata of the language—literary, colloquial, provincial, obsolete.

To the principles of Comparative Philology he does not propose to add much that is new or startling. He follows on the whole the main lines accepted by all philologists, but he puts forward two or three suggestions affecting both the general theory and also certain details. Under the former are his views on Ablaut, which he holds has in the past been unduly restricted by too rigid an insistence on one definite vowel in the assumed primitive. Thus just as in the word-group to which belongs *paciscor* we must, he says, postulate a form \*pāk- as well as \*pēk-, and in *carus* forms with \*cā- and \*cē-, so he proposes \*tē- \*tā-, \*sē- \*sā- and so on as parallel forms. He also condemns the reluctance which has hitherto prevailed to accept freely a general Ablaut-relation ā, ă; ē, ê; ō, ô: and it is for this reason that he marks with the double quantity roots which are commonly marked as long or short, but not as both. Neither suggestion can be accepted. As regards details he protests against the assumption that initial gh- becomes f- in Latin before the vowel u. It is true that the only example is *fundo*, which seems to accord so well with Skt. hu-, Gk. χέω, Goth. giutan < I.-E. \*ǵheu- both in

meaning and in form. He therefore severs *fundo* from this group and derives it from I.-E. \*bheu.dh-, which he finds in Goth. biudan (to offer), O.Eng. beod (table), and of which he says the root-meaning is 'to spread.' This equation, however, raises greater difficulties than the isolation of gh- becoming f-. He also suggests that intervocalic -ts- in early Latin words became -s- and supports this by his derivation of such words as *cisum*, *miser*, *casa*, *pisum*, etc.: but, as the derivation of all these words is very uncertain and -ts- in verb forms gives -ss-, the suggestion cannot be accepted. He further proposes that the loss of one of the geminated consonants in such words as *mamilla*, *farina*, etc., should be regarded as a phonetic law and not as an occasional phenomenon.

Professor Tucker's studies have been largely semasiological, and it is in this department that most of the novelty of his theories lies. He is resolved to penetrate to the very bed-rock meaning of the Indo-European roots and by bringing more of them into mutual relation thereby reduce their number. The great danger in such work is over-speculation, and Professor Tucker, who is fully aware of this, expresses the hope that he has performed his task with all circumspection and sobriety; but I think that in this respect he has gone very much further than most philologists will be prepared to follow. He makes great play with such primitive notions as 'go,' 'turn,' etc., and pursues them through all their linguistic appearances both in their literal and metaphorical applications. He gives a typical example in the preface, pp. v-vi. From the root \*ēi-ēr- and its various grades he derives Skt. *ir* (go), Lat. *aerusco*, Gk. ἵπος, Goth. *airus*, O.Eng. *aērende*, Eng. *errand*, Gk. εἶρ, ὄρος, ὄρα, Av. *yārs*, Gk. αἶρα (darnel), Lat. *acra*, Skt. *erakā* (a kind of grass), Lat. *aero*, Gk. αἶρων, εἶραι, εἶρεπος, Lat. *aerumna* (of which the primitive meaning is 'bundle'), Gk. εἰρήνη and εἶρων. As cumulative evidence he adduces the root \*ēi-ēl-, from which he gets O.H.G. *ilan*, Cymr. *ilio*, Gk. ἰάλλω, ἰλλω, ἰλλός (squinting), ἰλιον, εἰλίποδες, πέδιλα, Lat. *ilia*; and the root \*bhēi-, whence he derives Gk. φοιτᾶν, O.Swed. *bisa*,

M.H.G. *bisen*, O.Eng. *bisig*, Eng. *bee*, Germ. *billig*, Gk. φιλύρα, φοίνιξ, Lat. *fibra*, *fīlum*, *foedus*, *fidus*, Gk. πιστός, O.Eng. *bād* (pledge), Alb. *bē* (oath), and so on. To say the least of it, the semasiological variations are far from easy and many of the words are of very doubtful etymology, the origin of Latin *aerusco*, *aera*, *aerumna*, *fibra*, *funis* in particular being very obscure. Or take an example from the body of the work where he brings together *pinus*, *pinguis*, *pirus*, *pisum*, *pituita*, *piget*, *pignus*, *paene*, *paenitet*, *pinso*, etc., as all ultimately derived from a root \*pēi- meaning 'to spread, smear, ooze, be juicy,' etc. Thus *pinus* is so named because of its 'sap,' but *pirum* is also 'the sappy' and *pisum* 'the juicy,' because 'the name belonged to the succulent stage of the pea,' *abies* is also 'sappy,' and from the same root is *Abella*, with which goes *apple*, also 'the sappy,' and *amnis* <\*āb- meaning 'to flow, spread forth,' and so on. Another favourite idea of Professor Tucker is that of 'smearing,' which he finds in *ambrosia* <\*mret- (cf. *merda*, Goth. *smairpa*). 'It has nothing to do with immortality, but is connected with βρότος (blood), βρέτας ("the blood-stained image"), and αἶμα is "smeary matter" from the same root as that of σάπο, *sebum*.' So he takes *adoleo* as originally meaning 'smear' from a root \*ēl- which he finds in *olea*, ἔλαια, and *adolere deos* meant originally 'to smear the divine images,' and he compares the relation between Eng. *blood* and *bless*. The same fundamental idea he finds also in *flāmen*, *delubrum* (= 'an anointed object') and so on.

The doctrine of 'Sabine l for d' in such words as *oleo*, *lacrima*, *lingua*, *levir* he rejects, and he treats them as developed in Latin itself from inherited material. The l of *lingua* is probably due to *lingo*, but it is very difficult to see with Tucker how *lacrima* has been influenced by *lac*, or *levir* by a notion of \*lēg-uir (as in *collega*), or how *oleo* is to be separated from *odor* and derived from \*ol-ēi- (as in *olea*). He adds: 'For the regular connexion of oozing, smearing, and smelling v. *merda*, *selago*.'

Many more of his etymologies can only be regarded as more imaginative than plausible. Such are *abdomen*



<\*dēu (=bind); *agnus* from a root meaning 'cut' (cf. Goth. *agizi*=axe); *pontifex*='spell-binder' from a root \*spen- (cf. O.H.G. *spanst*); *asinus*, so named because of its 'ashy, dun, or burnt colour' (cf. Skt. *asita*-, or from the root of *āter*); *bos* he thinks is a normal Latin word <\*bēu (=swell out); *cānus* he connects with *careo* as being originally='exhaust, empty', and s.v. *albus* he says the whiteness implied is that of exhaustion or death, and he connects Gk. ἀλαφύζω and perhaps λαφύσσω. In *exilium* he finds the root \*sel (=seat), and in *centum* \*kem-, with which he compares Goth. *hansa* (=handful). In *arbiter* he finds the root \*bhēi (=bind), which appears also in *filum*, *fldes*. For *venio* and its cognates he postulates \*g<sup>h</sup>ēm- \*g<sup>h</sup>ēn-

\*g<sup>h</sup>ā-, and from the middle one of these he also derives Eng. *queen*, *quean*, Ir. *ben*, Boeot. βανά. 'These have the sense of making come forth, producing, giving birth (cf. Eng. "come off" a stock, Germ. *Abkömmling*, Lat. *proventus*)'; and hence also he derives the first

part of βασιλεύς <\*βατι- <\*g<sup>h</sup>nti-="stock," and cf. Eng. *king* as related to Lat. *gens*. *Persōna* he boldly connects with *sōnare*, and *vīnum*='expressed juice' <\*vēi- (=exude, be juicy), which he also finds in *vīrus*, *viscum*, *vitrum*. These are all typical of Professor Tucker's methods, and none of them I think will prove acceptable. His learning is very wide, his ingenuity is amazing, but he has allowed it far to outrun his judgment.

University of Leeds.

P. S. NOBLE.

## TWO BOOKS ON CONSTANTINE.

*Constantine the Great and the Christian Church* (The Raleigh Lecture on History, 1929). By NORMAN H. BAYNES, F.B.A. From the Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. XV. Pp. 107. London: Humphrey Milford, 1929. Paper, 6s. net.

*Constantine the Great and the Christian Revolution*. By G. P. BAKER. Pp. x+351. Frontispiece: coins with portrait types; 7 maps and plans. London: Eveleigh Nash and Grayson, Ltd., 1931. Cloth, 18s.

IN introducing the subject of his paper Mr. Baynes suggests certain reasons for the extreme diversity of the views of modern historians on the personality of Constantine: 'We write our biographies in terms of the thought of our own day, and impose upon another age the standards with which we are familiar.' This is the fundamental error of Burckhardt's study: Constantine, as 'a man of genius, whose ambition and love of power refuse to leave him a moment's peace,' is—axiomatically—'essentially unreligious.' Others, like Schwartz, whose 'master key' to Constantine is 'the will to power,' succumb to the 'more subtle danger' of oversimplification. Mr. Baynes undertook the present study from 'the conviction

that the true starting-point for any comprehension of the reign must be Constantine's own letters and edicts.' He believes the documents cited by Eusebius and Athanasius, or contained in the dossier of Optatus, to be genuine, with the possible exception of the sermon 'To the Assembly of the Saints.' The paper is therefore a sketch of the religious history of Constantine's reign, with special regard to these documents and analyses of significant passages in them. Mr. Baynes' conclusion is that from the time of the battle of the Milvian bridge Constantine had 'definitely identified himself with Christianity,' that he had 'the conviction of a personal mission entrusted to him by the Christian God,' and that in his thought 'the prosperity of the Roman state is intimately—one may, I think, say necessarily—linked to the cause of unity within the Catholic Church. If God is to do His part, the Emperor and the Christian Church must render to Him in return . . . the loyalty of concord.'

The paper itself occupies barely thirty pages. Seventy-four are devoted to a commentary which will be of very great value to students of the period. They will find there a more detailed examin-

ation of modern views on Constantine than was possible in the text, a justification of Mr. Baynes' belief in the authenticity of his sources, and discussions of innumerable problems connected with the subject. Here, as readers familiar with the author will expect, bibliography is brought to a fine art. In an appendix Mr. Baynes examines the problem of the 'Sol Invictus' type, which appears on Constantine's coins as late as 323, and makes a brilliant contribution towards the solution of it.

Mr. Baker has undertaken the difficult task of writing a popular biography of Constantine. His book is written in an easy and discursive style, reminiscent rather of the novel than of the historical monograph, with an excessively generous leavening of elucidation and comment. If he is not too easily deterred by philosophical platitudes the general reader will find much to interest and instruct him. There are good character sketches of the third century emperors and of Constantine himself, and illuminating pictures of contemporary society. The political and administrative reforms of Diocletian and Constantine and their dealings with the Christian Church are adequately described. The account of the Arian controversy at any rate reveals the author's power as a lively and entertaining narrator. If the treatment of political events is not always satisfying,

the meagreness of the sources is no doubt mainly to blame, though the reader may sometimes feel that his difficulties are accentuated rather than removed by the breezy self-confidence of his author.

The analyses of economic and social developments are perhaps the weakest part of the book. The suggestion on page 8 (in an introductory chapter) that the senate and army might with advantage have arranged to wield power alternately, like modern party governments, seems a fitting climax to the discussion of the 'duel' between those two institutions. In his survey of 'the New Empire' (chapter 8) Mr. Baker seems to think that there was no alternative to Constantine's policy of economic 'stabilisation'; but the discussion on page 206 is not enough to refute the views of the 'modern old gentlemen' who 'are in the habit of believing that they could have run the empire better. . .'. Is there any justification for attributing to Galerius the policy of making the Christian Church a 'closed hereditary corporation' (p. 134)? In the last chapter (a series of observations on the fall of the Roman Empire) there is a confusion between 'castes' and 'tribes,' and the astonishing catalogue of emigrants from northern Europe on page 324 needs correction.

G. W. RICHARDSON.

University of Leeds.

N. Π. 'Ελευθεριάδης, Πελασγική 'Ελλάς, οἱ Προέλληνες, τύποις Κ. Σ. Παπαδογιάννη, ἐν Ἀθήναις, 1931. Pp. 352.

THE author of this ambitious work, dissatisfied with current opinions about the origin and spread of the Indo-European languages and about the pre-Indo-European civilisations, propounds his own view of the whole matter. It would be impossible to give here even a summary indication of what his theory is, and it must suffice to say that it is of a wholly unsatisfactory character. The central doctrine seems to be that all linguistic forms encountered in Europe, North Africa and Western Asia are in the last analysis Semitic, but the author is very far from being adequately equipped for the task of making his thesis seem probable. It is to be hoped that he will not persevere with the larger work of which this volume is stated to be a first instalment.

R. MCKENZIE.

St. John's College, Oxford.

*Topographie von Athen.* Second edition, entirely revised. (Müller's *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft*, III. 2, ii.) By WALTHER JUDEICH. Pp. xii + 473; xxiv plates, 56 text-figures, 4 plans in pocket at end. Munich: Beck, 1931. 33 M. (sewn); 38 M. (cloth).

THIS is in every way an improved edition of Judeich's famous *Topographie*, enlarged by over fifty pages, embellished with excellent photographs, mostly reproductions from Hege's illustrated work on the Acropolis, and more attractively presented, since the old numbered paragraphs are abolished and all references relegated to footnotes. The author is to be warmly congratulated on the success with which he has digested and incorporated in the text the fruits of twenty-five years' work and discovery in the field of Athenian topography in its widest sense. Actually, the only omission we can detect is Sisson's paper on the Library of Hadrian (*Papers*, B.S.R. XI.). This mass of fresh

material does not in any way impair the flow of the narrative, which is pre-eminently clear and well proportioned. It is instructive to note the author's conversion to the views of Dörpfeld, both as to the Enneakrounos and as to the 'Old Athena Temple' (the latter foreshadowed by his article in *Hermes* LXIV., 1929), though he suspends judgment as to the original plan of the Erechtheion. Buschor's 'Ur-Parthenon' and Heberdey's early Propylon with *poros* sculptures in its pediment are rejected after a fair hearing. In fact in all the countless controversies over Athenian topography and monuments we are struck by the essential fair-mindedness of the author no less than by his remarkable mastery of the material. We must confess that there are rather more inaccuracies in the printing than might be expected in a work of this importance. A list of those noticed by the present reviewer (*J.H.S.* LI. [1931], p. 113) may be consulted, and possibly amplified, by the curious; but they will not have the effect of diminishing the gratitude of all readers for this admirable, not to say indispensable, publication.

A. M. WOODWARD.

University of Sheffield.

*Aristote: Physique.* Tome second (V.-VIII.), texte établi et traduit par HENRI CARTERON. Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1931. 30 fr.

THE first volume of Monsieur Carteron's Budé text and translation of the *Physics* appeared in 1926; the editor having died in the interval, the present volume has been prepared for the press by Monsieur Léon Robin.

The present edition on its title-page claims to establish the text of the *Physics*, but this claim can hardly be justified, and a satisfactory text has still to be made. Bekker's text is out of date and the *apparatus criticus* leaves much to be desired, and Prantl's Teubner text, which has long been out of print, is little better. The labours of Bonitz, Diels, Torstrick, Shute, and Mansion helped to improve matters, and the present editor has availed himself of their work, but it might have been expected that a French editor of the *Physics* would have made a complete new collation of E (Parisiensis, 1853), which has only been consulted for certain passages, and that the *apparatus criticus* would contain the readings of Vindobonensis too, an early-tenth-century MS., the importance of which was first recognised in 1892 by A. Gercke, who considered it to be the archetype of Bekker's MSS. F, G, and I, and to represent a more ancient tradition than E. This MS. has been made good use of by F. H. Fobes (who has given a careful description of it in *C.R.* XXVII. [1913], pp. 250-2) for his edition of the *Meteorology*, by W. D. Ross for the *Metaphysics* of Aristotle, and by these two scholars for their edition of the *Metaphysics* of Theophrastus.

Monsieur Carteron's translation appears to be both accurate and readable. A résumé and summary is prefixed to each book, and there is an excellent index. The division of the text into short paragraphs and the insertion of inset

headings in the translation are a great help to the reader. There is a welcome absence of the misprints which disfigure some of the volumes of the series.

Zeno's Fourth Argument (239B 33 ff.) is difficult to follow without illustrative figures, and references might well have been given to the extensive literature dealing with the Four Arguments.

The second text of the first three chapters of Book VII., which seems to be another edition or a very early paraphrase, is given in an appendix.

EDW. S. FORSTER.

University of Sheffield.

*De regum hellenisticorum epistulis in lapidibus servatis quaestiones stilisticæ.* By F. SCHROETER. Pp. vi+113. Leipzig: Teubner, 1932. Paper, Rm. 5.

THIS good and useful book is an examination of the official style of writing used by the secretaries of the Hellenistic courts, a style which even affected Polybius. The foundations of an analysis of this style were laid by W. Schubart in his article in *Archiv für Papyrusforschung*, 1920, from the better-known letters; Schroeter carries on the work and has made a complete collection from the inscriptions, omitting letters given in papyri (though some are used as illustrations) and those preserved only in *oratio obliqua*, and has been able to print sixty-five letters and twenty-two fragments, the texts occupying more than half the book. The collection, which will be a boon to the historian, is well up to date, and includes the various letters to the Coans published by R. Herzog in 1930; it is unfortunate that *B.C.H.*, 1930, Part II, appeared too late for Schroeter to use, as it contains some criticisms by L. Robert of Herzog's supplements and also M. Holleaux' decipherment of the date of *OGIS* 224, which shows that the writer was Antiochus III and not, as here given (No. 14), Antiochus II. Schroeter's analysis of the style of the letters establishes the main fact that it was the same in all the kingdoms; even a scribe in Bithynia is seen wrestling with formulae a little outside his competence. Various points of interest are well brought out: the euphemisms whereby kings gave orders to cities in fact without seeming to give orders in form; the fact that only one dynasty, the Seleucid, used the direct imperative even to its own officials; the remarkable tone of benignity in the letters (were those that were otherwise not preserved by the recipients?); the practical restriction of that typical word *φιλαθρῶν* to the king's acts. Schroeter decides that almost all the extant letters were written by secretaries; only four—two of Attalus II to Attis and those of Philip V to Larisa—were, he thinks, written by the kings themselves, though one or two others may be doubtful. But, curiously, he does not consider the 'half-way house'; I think we need a third type of letter—that of Antigonos I to Scepsis would be an instance—in which the king gave the secretary a rough jotting to put into formal order and the secre-

tary in places reproduced the actual words of the jotting. For example, when a high official is named without his title, like 'Menogenes' in *OGIS* 315 VI, or 'the son and Callicrates' in Ptolemy II's letter to Miletus, it would seem that this can only be due to the king; a secretary must have given the great man his title.

W. W. TARN.

*Osiris: A Study in Myths, Mysteries, and Religion.* By H. P. COOKE. Pp. 169. London: The C. W. Daniel Company, 1931. 5s. net.

MR. COOKE says in his Preface that he knows his views are not 'those now entertained among orthodox, academical circles,' but trusts they are 'deserving of careful attention as well as of refutation.' Unfortunately they are not, for he clearly has no notion of how to study an obscure religious problem. He uses Plutarch's *De Iside et Osiride* in a way which shows his innocence of such studies as *Quellengeschichte* and of the difference between Egyptian ritual and Graeco-Egyptian mystic cults. He blends in a quaint manner information about Egypt from good authorities such as Petrie and Budge with speculations of the last century concerning astral myths. He thus presents us with various old friends—a solar Osiris and a solar Dionysos, signs of the zodiac and other constellations which are connected with gods and even with quite minor figures of myth, such as the horse which Horos preferred to the lion and the pillar in which Isis found Osiris' body—and, of course, priestly wisdom embodied in mysteries. Since he obviously does not lack interest in the subject, he would do well to orient himself by reading such works as Pfister's *Religion der Griechen und Römer* and the latest edition of Chantepie de la Saussaye, and then to remember that to study the religion of any country one must have a good acquaintance with its language and history.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

*The Main Institutions of Roman Private Law.*

By W. W. BUCKLAND. Pp. xii+410. Cambridge: University Press, 1931. Cloth, 16s. PROFESSOR BUCKLAND may be accounted fortunate in having devoted himself to a subject which its enemies call dead, for he has at least the advantage that the great work which he has done will not date. There is, however, little point in reviewing a book by him on Roman Law: Romanists will acquire and read it at the first opportunity, whatever a reviewer may say, while nothing will induce anti-Romanists to read anything in favour of this subject. It is sufficient to note that the present book shows no diminution of the author's powers: intense sanity of view (which distinguishes him from so many civilians), sincerity, absence of bias, acuteness of insight, are as fully revealed here as ever. The book purports to be for the use of students who have already made a beginning in the study of Roman Law, aiming at giving them a general view of the different institutions of the Private Law and of the notions which underlie

them. It certainly does this, but it does more also, for there can be no civilian so learned as not to be stimulated and interested by its contents.

J. W. C. TURNER.

Trinity Hall, Cambridge.

*C. Plinio Cecilio Secundo: Epistole scelte.* Ed. V. D'AGOSTINO. Pp. xxxii+132. Turin: Società Editrice Internazionale, 1931. Paper, L. 6.

THIS volume contains forty letters (I. 1, 9, 24; II. 6, 8, 18; III. 3, 5, 7, 12, 14, 21; IV. 13, 18, 19; V. 3, 10; VI. 4, 15, 16, 20; VII. 3, 4, 9, 21, 26; VIII. 4, 16; IX. 12, 15, 23, 34, 36, 40; X. 33, 34, 94-97), on the whole a fairly representative selection. Noticeable omissions are perhaps II. 17 (the Laurentine villa), VII. 27 (the ghost story), and VIII. 8 (the Clitumnus). The text is substantially that of Kukula (Teubner, 1923) with slight divergences. The commentary is fuller than one would expect for the series (being on a very much greater scale, for example, than the English selection of Prichard and Bernard) and contains many valuable references and quotations.

The following points may be noted: on letter II. some note is needed on the meanings of *titulus* and *index*: on page 34 *ad fin.* the reference to Martial should be 9, 87 not 9, 86: on page 19 *quadrivremes* needs a note: on page 121 the birthplace of Propertius is given as Asisium without mention of an alternative, which in an Italian edition is rather remarkable: on letter XXXIX. there is no note of the notice which the letter attracted among the early Christian writers. Generally great attention is paid to idiom and rather less than is usual in school editions to syntax.

The introduction gives a very satisfactory summary of Pliny's life (though one would have liked also to find a reasonable estimate of his character as revealed in his letters), an extensive account of his works, and a note on manuscripts and modern editions, which mentions neither Gierig's edition nor Guillemin's in the Budé series. Altogether it is a very sound and serviceable little volume.

R. W. MOORE.

The Schools, Shrewsbury.

HELGE LYNGBY: *Textkritiska Studier till Celsus' Medicina.* Pp. viii+89. Göteborg: Eranos' Förlag, 1931.

THIS work embodies a textual study of passages where the writer thinks he can better the text of Marx. His treatment is careful, but readers are hardly likely to be impressed by his success. Let me mention, in order to rescue it from oblivion, an edition unknown to Lyngby, that of Dr. Andrew Morris, *A. Corn. Celsus De Re Medica. Accessurus Index Vocabulorum Omnium, et cuiuscunque ad Rem pertinentis More Dictionarii.* (Glasgae: excudebat Gulielmus Bell, 1766.) The dictionary apparently never saw the light.

A. SOUTER.

University of Aberdeen.



*Textkritiska Studier till Arnobius.* By G. WIMAN. Pp. vi+69. Göteborg: Eranos' Förlag, 1931. Paper, 4 kronor.

THE text of Arnobius' *Adversus Gentes* is preserved in one (Paris) MS. only, and was last edited by Reifferscheid in 1875. As manuscript collation was in those days rarely as minute as it is now, and Reifferscheid's apparatus is in consequence rather scanty, Wiman has wisely gone to the MS. itself. He has consulted all the recent work on Arnobius, and his emendations are well grounded. Many of them are certainly correct, and I hope he will see his way to give us a new edition of Arnobius. He has revealed a curious fact, unique in my experience, that many words in the MS. have lost their first letter. The simplest explanation of this phenomenon seems to be this, that our MS. derives from one where the first letter of each column was intended to be filled in by an illuminator, who never carried out his duty. If this explanation be correct, that MS. probably belonged to the fifth century. Wiman would have found more examples of *obsoletare* (p. 46) if he had consulted J. E. B. Mayor's edition of Tertullian's *Apology*, page 247.

A. SOUTER.

University of Aberdeen.

SISTER M. THERESA OF THE CROSS SPRINGER, *Nature-Imagery in the Works of Saint Ambrose*. Pp. xxii+147. The Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C., 1931. Paper, \$3.50.

THIS is the ninth contribution to the study of St. Ambrose in the 'Patristic Studies' of the Catholic University of America. Such contributions are all the more welcome that Ambrose, singularly attractive though he is, had suffered undeserved neglect. Each group of the Saint's works is separately considered, and the whole book provides a most pleasing picture of his attitude to natural phenomena. The author shows a thorough acquaintance not only with Ambrose's works, but also with modern general works on the attitude of the ancients to nature, and her classification is so elaborate that one can immediately find his views on any point about nature, inorganic and organic. The Latin text of Ambrose is not given, but instead we get an English paraphrase of each passage, with a reference to the original in a footnote. The following errors should be corrected: *gurgis* (p. 18) does not mean 'a whirlpool,' but 'deep flowing water': it is hasty to refer to a 'curious fiction' (p. 58) that wild beasts become more savage if the odour of wine comes to them: *messam* (p. 84) should be *messeem*, and *odiferos* (p. 95) should be *odoriferos*: 'Pomponio' should be 'Pomponius' and 'Salina' should be 'Solinus' (p. 101): 'Hasting's' should be 'Hastings' (p. 101): 'versality' (p. 137) should be 'versatility.' The book, which is provided with adequate summaries of its conclusions, may be commended to all nature-lovers, whether they be interested in St. Ambrose or not.

A. SOUTER.

University of Aberdeen.

*Karakter en Cultuur der Romeinen in Sint Augustinus' De Civitate Dei I-V.* By AGNES DICKER. Pp. viii+221. Nijmegen and Utrecht: Dekker en van de Vegt, 1931. Paper.

THIS substantial work is in Dutch, but a three-page 'Rückblick' in German is provided at the end. It is the fruit of a careful study of the original text of the *De Civitate Dei I-V*, as well as of a large number of the modern books that illustrate the subject, whether in English, French, or German. English readers will be gratified to see the wide use made of the work of Warde Fowler. The book is provided with copious references to the original Latin, and will probably be helpful even to those who can read the original for themselves. The chapter on the theatre, including the shows, is perhaps the most interesting of all. With regard to the point raised on p. 66, n. 4, it has become clear to me that careful persons wrote *aereus* for the adjective derived from *aes* and *aerius* for the derivative of *aer*, the latter of course following the Greek spelling.

The real reason of Augustine's attitude to Livy (p. 197) is no doubt the fact that he, like his pupil Orosius, did not possess him save in epitome form. It is highly probable, in fact, that there was not one complete copy of Livy in the whole African continent. As regards the bibliography, the finest edition of the *De Civitate Dei* (Munich, Bremer Press, 1924), by Carl Weyman, has been overlooked: the work of E. Gilson, *Introduction à l'Étude de Saint Augustin* (Paris, 1930), perhaps appeared too late to be mentioned, but certainly Weiskotten's edition of Possidius (Princeton, 1919) should have been employed in preference to Migne.

A. SOUTER.

University of Aberdeen.

*Roman Britain. The Objects of Trade.* By LOUIS C. WEST, Litt.D. Pp. ii+108. Oxford: Blackwell, 1931. Boards, 5s. net.

IN this monograph of 108 pages Dr. West carries on the work familiar to all who have read or consulted his articles on Roman Egypt and Syria or his book on Imperial Roman Spain (see *C.R.* 1931, p. 35). This book has the same objects and is on the same scale; it shows the same exhaustive investigation of sources, whether literary or archaeological, and the same careful collection of facts. The reviewer has not sufficient archaeological knowledge nor enough leisure to verify and check the hundreds of references given; the thoroughness of the work is amazing, and misprints or misreferences (which are apt to occur in a work of this description) do not appear to be either frequent or important. No one will be greatly troubled by Scrip. Largus or Solinius or find it hard to correct Amboglanna to Camboglanna, Kirby Thore to Kirby Thore, Grinstead to Grinstead, and Danymyneck to Llanymynech; even the sinister remark that 'if Caesar found the hen in England, the eggs not being used for good, the bird had been brought in from Gaul,' etc., will puzzle no one who has any instinct for textual emendation. Incidentally,

there is no reference to the export of 'Blue John' from the Castleton caverns to Italy, although local guides are full of it; one would like to see this story either confirmed or quashed.

But enough; it is so easy to find an occasional error, and so hard adequately to convey gratitude to Dr. West for the weeks of patient toil necessary to complete so useful a book. The fate of those scholars who devotedly compile indices to Xenophon or Suetonius or wade through inscriptions to provide catalogues or lists is sometimes hard; their successors draw upon their labours with little gratitude, merely noting with a snarl some slip or misnumeration. Let it not be so here: anyone in future who wants to know anything (beyond mere superficialities) about the commercial life of the Roman Empire must use Dr. West's books and articles and start from them.

M. P. CHARLESWORTH.

St. John's College, Cambridge.

*Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch.* Von ALOIS WALDE. Dritte Auflage von J. B. HOFMANN. IV<sup>te</sup> Lieferung. Heidelberg: Winter, 1931.

In its eighty closely-printed pages the fourth part of the new Walde includes words from *cocetum* to *cycnus*. Like the previous parts this is an entirely new work, both because of the vast amount of new material introduced and because of the greatly enlarged and improved treatment of the remainder. In the former class are the articles on *colisatum*, *collifana*, *colpus*, *columbares*, *coma*, *condoma*, *condurdum*, *conferva*, *conger*, *conopium*, *consolda*, *cephinus*, *corallium*, *corgus*, *corocollas*, *cortumia*, *corydalis*, *coloneum*, *collabus*, *crassantius*, *cremor*, *crepus*, *creterra*, *crissonus*, *crotha*, *crupellarius*, *crupla*, *cucutia*, *culilla*, *cummi*, *cunila*, *cupencus*, *cupressus*, *curcuma*, *curritae*, *curucus*, *cuspus*, *cycnus*. Especially good are the articles on *compesco*, *com-*, *coniveo*, *consilium*, *coquo*, *cor*, *corium*, *cornix*, *corpus*, *creper*, *cubitus*, *cutius*, *cunus*. Among other improvements on the second edition may be noticed the separation of *cohortor* from *cohors*, for the verb has no special idea of encouraging troops; the separation of *creber* from *cresco*; and the definite improvement in the etymology of *cogito*, *coram*, *cortina*, *curis*. It is difficult to accept the view that *condio* is from the same root as *condo*, and that *crudelis* is formed from *crudus* on the analogy of *fidus*: *fidelis*. The connexion is far from obvious. Very doubtful, it seems to me, is the etymology of *cōnor* as 'the iterative-intensive to Gk. *κονέω* (cf. *πῶδος*: *πῶτος*)', and it is difficult to connect *convicium* with *vōx*, *vocare* because of the *ī*.

University of Leeds.

P. S. NOBLE.

J. RAEDER: *Oribasii Collectionum Medicarum reliquiae*. Volumen III. Libri XXIV-XXV, XLIII-XLVIII. Pp. viii+291. (Corpus Medicorum Graecorum vi 2, 1.) Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1931. Cloth, RM. 20 (unbound, 18).

THIS volume of Oribasius carries the work to Book XLVIII of the *Collectiones Medicae*. It

is difficult for a reviewer to weigh the merits of such an edition as this unless he has himself collated the manuscripts whose readings are recorded. If the collations are free from error, there is no doubt that Raeder has produced the final edition of Oribasius. The most important part of the edition remains to be published—a full and accurate index.

W. H. S. JONES.

St. Catharine's College, Cambridge.

*La Critique des Textes.* By P. COLLOMP. Pp. iv+128. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1931. Paper, 12 francs.

THIS small treatise is written in a lively and attractive style, but I am not sure that I have derived as much benefit from it as I expected. It falls into two divisions, the first containing an account of what the author terms the 'système classique,' i.e. the method of Lachmann, Madvig and other great critics of the nineteenth century; the second devoted to new means and methods of constructing *stemma* of codices. The description of the classical method is often felicitous and always suggestive, though I think it is more likely to be of use to a good teacher than to an ordinary pupil. It is not sufficiently illustrated by examples, and a book on textual criticism which is not copiously furnished with examples from actual texts is like a book on art without illustrations. Professor Collomp's examples from actual texts are few and the reference to their source is not always given.

In the second part, in which it is easy to see that the author's main interest lies, he deals with the construction of *stemma* and their employment in objective, or as he terms it 'genealogical' criticism, as opposed to the subjective criticism 'd'inspiration et goût.' Here we are glad to see that he recognises the value of Professor A. C. Clark's brilliant researches into the descent of MSS. Clark's results, however, will only carry the critic one stage on the journey, and Professor Collomp relies for the most part on the methods of Dom Quentin, the learned editor of the new Vulgate, whose views were first given to the world in his *Mémoire* published in 1922.

Dom Quentin's method offers us what we should all like to have—a *stemma* tracing all existing MSS. back to some ancient archetype, if not to the original text, and, based on that *stemma*, an iron rule (*règle de fer*) by which we can separate the good readings from the bad almost as a riddle separates the fine meal from the coarse. I myself find Dom Quentin's system hard to work and uncertain in its application, and I do not find that his new adherent makes it any easier. The *stemma* illustrated in the text are confused and badly drawn, so that it is difficult to follow the argument which they are intended to illustrate. Also they are all abstract and imaginary, and after a time work like a frenzy in the brain which seeks to apply them to something concrete. One longs to fit them to some existing text, but cannot think of any text to which they can be fitted. It is conceivable that some such mechanical system might

prove useful as a labour-saving device within the limited area of a mediaeval text where the tradition is simple and complete or nearly complete. One of our own countrymen, Dr. Greg, has already made such an attempt, and M. Collomp might well have noticed his *Calculus of Variants* published by the Oxford Press in 1927. It may even prove useful within certain areas of so splendid and, on the whole, equable tradition as that of the Vulgate Old Testament, but it is hard to see of what use it can ever be in the complex tradition of most of the great Greek and Latin classical texts. In the Greek authors the complexity of the tradition is now shown by the evidence of the papyri, and here I frankly do not understand M. Collomp's solution of the difficulty. At one time he quarrels with the use of the term 'eclectic' as applied to the text of some papyri on the ground that it is putting the cart before the horse, since there were no separate families of the text from which the papyrus could choose its readings. At another time he seems to regard an eclectic papyrus as the result of 'mixture' or 'contamination' from families of text which had already begun to take shape in the papyrus age. It would be interesting to see his theory applied to the text of Xenophon's *Anabasis*, where I think most critics would now agree that the group of MSS. known as the *meliores*, on which the older editors founded their texts, descend from an 'edited' MS. of the ninth or tenth century, full of wilful transpositions, of substituted synonyms and simplified constructions, while the *deteriores* often show a more original character in their readings. Both spring from the same archetype, but the character of that archetype inclined much more towards the *deteriores* than towards the *meliores*. Here I do not see how any iron rule could help or how we can escape from subjective criticism.

F. W. HALL.

St. John's College, Oxford.

*Sexual Life in Ancient Greece.* By HANS LICHT. Translated by J. H. FRESE. Edited by L. H. DAWSON. Pp. 557. London: Routledge, 1931. Cloth, 42s.

HERR LICHT throughout his book concentrates rather upon the literary significance of sex in Greece than on its social aspect. There is little or no treatment of the anatomical and physiological factors and even less of the psychological. A perusal of the list of contents will give a good idea both of the scope and of the tone of the work. Part I., after introductory chapters on the Position of Women, the Human Figure, Festivals and Erotic in Religion, is for the most part devoted to a review of the normal sex motifs in the whole range of Greek literature: Part II. deals with abnormalities, but, similarly, after short chapters on Masturbation, Tribadism and Prostitution, is in the main concerned with homosexual eroticism in literature: at the end of Part II. a brief section is appended on a few perversions of Greek sexual life, it being part of the author's thesis that the sexual life of the Greeks was very healthy and that 'those mani-

festations of sexual phenomena usually grouped together under the name of Psychopathia Sexualis played an extraordinarily small part in it.' The writing is often long-winded and the book contains much matter that is strictly irrelevant. The value of the work lies rather in the collection of material, though this does not always aim at exhaustiveness, than in any original conclusions. In fact there is little in the book that is new, though in this connection Licht's theory of Apollo Sauroktonos is worthy of note. He finds a very specious explanation in the erotic sense of *σαῦρος* (=lacerta) and compares Martial XIV. 172, seeing in this Apollo a deity of homosexuality.

It is a big book, well documented, and elaborately produced. It is hard to determine the principles on which the illustrations were chosen; some are of very dubious relevance. On page 514 *δευδαίμονα ἐν τοῖς μάλιστα* is translated as 'a highly pitiable' old man. There are misprints on pages 5, 200, 386, and on pages 213-4 we have several times 'Charities' for 'Charites,' and misprints in the Greek quotations are all too numerous.

R. W. MOORE.

*The Schools, Shrewsbury.*

*The Transition from the Late Latin Lyric to the Medieval Love Poem.* By STEPHEN GASELEE. Pp. 34. Cambridge: Bowes and Bowes, 1931. Paper, 2s. 6d. net.

IN this short essay Mr. Gaselee gives the substance of three lectures delivered at Cambridge on the J. H. Gray Foundation in the Michaelmas Term, 1930. He writes with his accustomed charm and with his usual brevity, which makes us wish for more. He begins with the last of the classical poets—Claudian, Rutilius Namatianus, and Sidonius—passing from them to Dracontius and the poets of the *Anthology*. It is a strange transition from them to Virgil the Grammarian and the *Hisperica Famina*. The second section is devoted mainly to the Christian hymn and the beginnings of rhymed and rhythmical verse. On p. 22 Mr. Gaselee suggests that the 'rich rhymes' found in the native Irish verse 'were transferred by the Celtic writers to their Latin compositions.' This question of native Irish rhymes is one on which it has always been difficult to obtain reliable information; but I have been assured on high authority that there is no early rhyme in Irish verse, and that the rhymed Latin set the example to the Irish. It is, indeed, quite clear that rhymes of every kind were familiar to the writers of rhetorical prose in classical and medieval times, and I have no doubt that rhyme passed from prose into verse. The Irish used the two-syllabled masculine rhyme very effectively in Latin, and centuries passed before it was really established on the Continent, although Virgil the Grammarian quotes examples of it in his strange treatises.

On the question of the early medieval love-lyrics, Mr. Gaselee concludes: 'They derive their form from the Christian hymn . . . especially the hymns written in stanzas of iambic dimeters and dactylic tetrameters, and their substance from the Song of Songs and the

nature-lyrics of the vernaculars, Ovid supervening later on. A curious descent—Ovid and the Shulamite, St. Ambrose and Erato: but this I think is their surprising genesis.

The influence of the Song of Songs on the poetical 'invitation' may be admitted, but most important of all must have been the vernacular love poetry. This is a factor which must be borne in mind during the whole history of the Latin love (and nature) lyric, and Mr. Gaselee does well in drawing attention to it. The fact of this influence is certain, even though not a fragment of such poetry had survived. The Christian hymn was a potent influence as regards form in the earlier period of which Mr. Gaselee treats, but it is interesting

to observe that in the later period the secular lyric employed an endless variety of forms which owed little to the example of liturgical verse. It is to the moral and religious (extra-liturgical) lyric, it is to the *piae cantiones*, that we must look for parallels; for the secular and the religious lyric grew up side by side, and poets like Walter of Châtillon and those of his school were masters of either kind. One thing seems clear: there is no bridge between the Ovidian school exercise and the secular love lyric. The influence of Ovid is doubtless there, as Mr. Gaselee says; but the school exercises of Marbod, Baudry, or Serlo of Wilton do not, as some writers have held, point the way to a new development.

F. J. E. RABY.

### BOOKS RECEIVED

- Anderson** (A. R.) *Alexander's Gate, Gog and Magog, and The Inclosed Nations*. Pp. viii+117. (Monographs of the Mediaeval Academy of America, No. 5.) Cambridge (U.S.A.): The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1932. Cloth, \$3.
- Attert** (C.), **Plasberg** (O.) *Ciceronis fasc. 48. De Officiis: iterum recognovit C.A. De Virtutibus: recognovit O.P.* Pp. xxvii+186. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubn.) Leipzig: Teubner, 1932. Cloth, RM. 4.32 (unbound, 3.60).
- Bailey** (K. C.) *The Elder Pliny's Chapters on Chemical Subjects. Part II. Edited, with translation and notes*. Pp. 299. London: Arnold, 1932. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Basore** (J. H.) *Seneca. Moral Essays. With an English translation. In 3 volumes. II.* Pp. xi+221. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1932. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.
- Bidez** (J.) *L'Empereur Julien. Œuvres complètes. Tome I—1<sup>re</sup> Partie. Discours de Julien César. Texte établi et traduit. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1932. Paper, 40 fr.*
- Bill** (F. X.) *Beiträge zur Lex Porsoniana*. Pp. 104. Emsdetten (Westphalia): H. und J. Lechte, 1932. Paper.
- Buscaroli** (C.) *Virgilio. Il Libro di Didone. Testo con traduzione a fronte seguito da ampio commento interpretativo ed estetico*. Pp. xvi+523. Milan, etc.: Soc. Anon. 'Dante Alighieri,' 1932. Paper, L. 18.
- Carré** (J. R.) *Fontenelle, De l'Origine des Fables (1724). Edition critique avec une introduction, des notes, et un commentaire*. Pp. vii+105. La Philosophie de Fontenelle, ou le Sourire de la Raison. Pp. 705. Paris: Alcan, 1932. Paper, 20 and 70 frs.
- Cary** (M.) *A History of the Greek World from 323 to 146 B.C.* Pp. xvi+448; 3 maps. (Methuen's History of the Greek and Roman World, III.) London: Methuen, 1932. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Cassirer** (E.) *Die platonische Renaissance in England und die Schule von Cambridge*. Pp. viii+143. (Studien der Bibliothek Warburg, XXIV.) Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1932. Paper, RM. 7.
- Cassirer** (H.) *Aristoteles' Schrift 'Von der Seele' und ihre Stellung innerhalb der aristotelischen Philosophie*. Pp. 198. (Heidelberger Abhandlungen zur Philosophie und ihrer Geschichte, 24.) Tübingen: Mohr, 1932. Paper, M. 10.20.
- Cesareo** (E.) *La Poesia di Calpurnio Siculo*. Pp. 220. Le Tragedie di Seneca. Pp. 115. Palermo (presso l'Autore, Via Catania, 18), 1931. Paper, L. 50 and 60.
- Cohoon** (J. W.) *Dio Chrysostom, with an English translation. Vol. I.* Pp. xv+570. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1932. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.
- Colson** (F. H.) and **Whitaker** (G. H.) *Philo. With an English translation. In ten volumes. IV.* Pp. x+582. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1932. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.
- Dahlmann** (H.) *Varro und die hellenistische Sprachtheorie*. Pp. 80. (Problemata, Heft 5.) Berlin: Weidmann, 1932. Paper, RM. 6.
- Drexler** (H.) *Plautinische Akzentstudien. I. Band.* Pp. viii+248. (Abh. d. Schlesischen Gesellschaft f. vaterländische Cultur, Geisteswissenschaftliche Reihe, 6. Heft.) Breslau: Marcus, 1932. Paper, M. 15.
- Durrbach** (F.) *Lycurge. Texte établi et traduit. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1932. Paper, 25 frs.*
- Faust** (A.) *Die Möglichkeitsgedanke. Systemgeschichtliche Untersuchungen. Zweiter Teil: Christliche Philosophie*. Pp. vii+356. Heidelberg: Winter, 1932. Paper, M. 13.50 (bound, 16).
- Gallavotti** (C.) *Luciano nella sua evoluzione artistica e spirituale*. Pp. xv+242. Lanciano: Carabba, 1932. Paper, L. 10.
- Gerstinger** (H.) *Mitteilungen aus der Papyrusammlung der Nationalbibliothek in Wien (Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer). Neue Serie. I. Folge*. Pp. 170; 1 plate. Vienna: Oesterr. Staatsdruckerei, 1932. Paper, S. 19.48.
- Gould** (H. E.) *Lucian's Charon. Edited with Introduction, Notes and Vocabulary for the use of Schools*. Pp. xx+107. (Elementary Classics.) London: Macmillan, 1932. Cloth, 2s.



- Grabmann (M.)** Eine lateinische Uebersetzung der pseudo-aristotelischen Rhetorica ad Alexandrum aus dem 13. Jahrhundert. Literarhistorische Untersuchung und Textausgabe. Pp. 81. (Sitzungsb. d. Bayerischen Akad. d. Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Abt., Jahrgang 1931/32. Heft 4.) Munich: Beck, 1932. Paper, M. 6.
- Gray (M. D.) and Jenkins (T.)** Latin for Today. First-year course. Edited by C. McEvoy. Pp. xxxii + 327; illustrations. London: Ginn. Cloth.
- Hanell (K.)** Das Menologium des Liber Glosarum. Pp. 32. (K. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundets i Lund Årsberättelse 1931-1932, II.) Lund: Gleerup, 1932. Paper, kr. 1.25.
- Helm (R.)** Apulei Opera. Vol. I. Metamorphoseon libri XI. Tertium edidit R. H. Pp. viii + 296. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubn.) Leipzig: Teubner, 1931. Cloth, R.M. 5.40 (unbound, 4.32).
- Herter (H.)** De Priapo. Pp. 336; 3 plates. (Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten, XXIII. Band.) Giessen: Töpelmann, 1932. Paper, M. 17.50.
- Illig (L.)** Zur Form der pindarischen Erzählung. Interpretationen und Untersuchungen. Pp. v + 108. Berlin: Junker und Dünhaupt, 1932. Paper, R.M. 4.50.
- Jones (L. W.)** The Script of Cologne from Hildebald to Hermann. Pp. xii + 98; 100 plates. Cambridge (U.S.A.): The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1932. Bound, \$20.
- Kroll (J.)** Gott und Hölle. Der Mythos vom Descensuskampfe. Pp. ix + 569. (Studien der Bibliothek Warburg, XX.) Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1932. Paper, R.M. 25.
- Leaf (W.)** 1852-1927. Some Chapters of Autobiography. With a Memoir by C. M. Leaf. Pp. xi + 338; 8 photographs. London: Murray, 1932. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- Lens (F. W.)** P. Ovidius Naso. Vol. III. fasc. 2. Fastorum libri VI. Post R. Ehwaldium iteratis curis edidit F. W. L. Pp. xxxii + 260. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubn.) Leipzig: Teubner, 1932. Cloth, R.M. 6.40 (unbound, 5.60).
- Lindblom (J.)** Zur Frage der Entstehung des Alphabets. Pp. 226. (K. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundets i Lund Årsberättelse 1931-1932, III.) Lund: Gleerup, 1932. Paper, kr. 1.40.
- Lobel (E.)** The Medieval Latin Poetics. Pp. 28. (From the Proceedings of the British Academy. Vol. XVII.) London: Milford. Paper, 2s. net.
- Loseby (H. V.)** Advanced Latin Prose. Pp. 176. London, etc.: Harrap, 1932. Cloth, 3s. 6d.
- McDonald (I. T.)** Renati Rapini Hortorum Libri IV. With an English translation by James Gardiner. Edited by I. T. M. Pp. xxxvii + 221. Worcester, Mass.: The Holy Cross Press, 1932. Cloth, \$2.15 postpaid.
- Murison (A. F.)** The Bucolics and Georgics of Vergil rendered in English Hexameters. Pp. ix + 129. London, etc.: Longmans, 1932. Cloth, 7s. 6d.
- Nixon (P.)** Plautus, with an English translation. In 5 volumes. IV. The Little Carthaginian Pseudolus, The Rope. Pp. ix + 438. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1932. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.
- Oltramare (A.)** Spurius Cassius et les origines de la démocratie romaine. Pp. 18. (Bulletin de la Société d'Histoire et d'Archéologie de Genève, Tome V—Livraison 4.) Geneva: Jullien, 1932. Paper.
- Philippart (H.)** Collections de Céramique grecque en Italie. Pp. 40; 6 plates, 4 figures. Brussels: Lamertin, 1932. Paper, 12 frs.
- Purdie (E.) and Saunders (M. B.)** Matriculation Latin. A practical Latin course. Pp. viii + 180. London: Bell, 1932. Cloth, 3s.
- Revista Clasică.** An. VII. (Tom. III.) No. 1-2. Ian.-Iunie 1931. Bucharest.
- Robertson (A. T.) and Davis (W. H.)** A New Short Grammar of the Greek Testament. Pp. xiv + 454. London: S.P.C.K., 1931. Cloth, 12s.
- Robinson (C. A.)** The Ephemerides of Alexander's Expedition. Pp. 81; portrait and map. (Brown University Studies.) Providence: Brown University, 1932. Cloth, \$3.
- Rohr (G.)** Platons Stellung zur Geschichte. Pp. 128. Berlin: Junker und Dünhaupt, Paper, R.M. 5.
- Skard (E.)** Zwei religiös-politische Begriffe. Euergetes-Concordia. Pp. 106. (Avhandlingar utgitt av Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo. II. Hist.-Filos. Klasse. 1931. No. 2.) Oslo: Dybwad, 1932. Kr. 5.
- Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association.** Vol. LXII. 1931. Pp. 234 + cxxxiii. Published through the Secretary, J. W. Hewitt, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Connecticut.
- Treble (H. A.)** Revision Sentences for Latin Prose. Interleaved edition. Pp. 95. London: University of London Press, 1932. Limp cloth, 1s.
- Villeneuve (F.)** Horace. Satires. Texte établi et traduit. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1932. Paper, 25 fr.
- Vitali (L.)** Fonti per la Storia della Religione cyrenaica. Pp. xxi + 167. (R. Università di Padova. Pubblicazioni della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia.) Padua: 'Cedam,' 1932. Paper, L. 20.
- von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (U.)** Der Glaube der Hellenen. II. Band. Pp. xii + 620. Berlin: Weidmann, 1932. Paper, R.M. 36 (bound, 40).
- Wendel (C.)** Die Ueberlieferung der Scholien zu Apollonios von Rhodos. Pp. 124. (Abh. d. Ges. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Kl., 3. Folge, Nr. 1.) Berlin: Weidmann, 1932. Paper, R.M. 8.
- Wilcken (U.)** Alexander the Great. Translated by G. C. Richards. Pp. 337. London: Chatto and Windus, 1932. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Witte (K.)** Die Geschichte der römischen Dichtung im Zeitalter des Augustus. Zweiter Teil: Horaz. Zweiter Band: Horazens Lyrik. 2. Lieferung. Pp. 93-192. Erlangen: im Selbstverlag des Verfassers, 1932. Paper.

(Loeb  
mann,  
t.  
origines  
ulletin  
tologie  
neva :

mique  
4 fig-  
Paper,  
ricula-  
Pp.  
n, 3s.  
n. 1-2.

New  
ment.  
1931.

Alex-  
t and  
Pro-  
h, \$3.  
ichte.  
haupt,

griffe.  
hand-  
kaps-  
lasse.  
Kr. 5.  
merican  
1931.  
a the  
niver-

Latin  
Lon-  
1932.

établi  
és de  
1932.

gione  
ità di  
Let-  
1932.

laube  
-620.  
A. 36

molien  
(Abh.  
Hist.  
mann,

lated  
don :  
net.

schen  
weiter  
yrik.  
: im  
er.

SEP 28 1932